

# Milk and Biopolitics: The emergence and re-conceptualization of food sovereignty in the raw milk movement as a means of resisting biopower

Master's Thesis

Astrid Emily Taylor

0214812

Supervisor: Mika Luoma-Aho

Spring 2014

University of Lapland

Faculty of Social Sciences

**Lapin yliopisto, yhteiskuntatieteiden tiedekunta**

Työn nimi: Milk and Biopolitics: The emergence and re-conceptualization of food sovereignty in the raw milk movement as a means of resisting biopower

Tekijä: Astrid Emily Taylor

Koulutusohjelma/oppiaine: Poliittikatieteet – Kansainväliset suhteet

Työn laji: Pro gradu –työ X Sivulaudaturtyö\_\_ Lisensiaatintyö\_\_

Sivumäärä: 87

Vuosi: 2014

**Tiivistelmä:** This investigation questions the validity of current academic discourses which seek to conceptualize food sovereignty, as it is currently defined, as a means of resisting neoliberalism. Instead, it is argued in this investigation, that the current attempts to articulate food movements and subsequently, food sovereignty, as a means of resisting neoliberalism, or as suggested by some as a means of resisting biopower, fail to do so and instead are themselves trapped in the circle of neoliberalism, which is evident in their arguments which simply act to reproduce forms of neoliberal governmentality. By drawing on Michel Foucault's notions of biopolitics, this investigation seeks to illustrate that food sovereignty can escape the circle of neoliberalism and become a means of resisting biopower and challenging neoliberal governmentality, however, in order to do so it needs to be re-conceptualized in order to be free of neoliberal governmentality. It will be argued that food sovereignty emerges and is re-conceptualized in the raw milk movement in the United States as a means of resisting biopower and challenging neoliberal governmentality. The argument will be based on the view that the raw milk movement when comprehended as a phenomenon which in its resistance of US government regulations, laws, and guidelines concerning raw milk, and subsequently, health, is resisting biopower. Furthermore, it will also be suggested, drawing on Foucault's notions of neoliberalism as understood through the Ordoliberals *gesellschaftspolitik*, coupled with Foucault's work on circulation, that *gesellschaftspolitik* is challenged by the raw milk activists participation in the cow-share, which entails an inherently anti-competitive means of obtaining dairy products, thus the cow-share serves to disrupt neoliberal understandings of the circulation of goods and in turn, challenges neoliberal governmentality.

Avainsanat: Food Sovereignty, Biopower, Neoliberal Governmentality, Raw Milk Movement, Food Movements, Healthism.

Muita tietoja:

Suostun tutkielman luovuttamiseen kirjastossa käytettäväksi\_X\_

Suostun tutkielman luovuttamiseen Lapin maakuntakirjastossa käytettäväksi\_X\_

(vain Lappia koskevat)

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	5
2. Background.....	7
2.1 Previous Research .....	7
2.2 Research Questions .....	14
2.3 Theoretical Framework .....	14
2.4 Material .....	15
2.4.1 The US Governmental Organizations Material.....	15
2.4.2 The Raw Milk Activist Material .....	16
2.4.3 Material Key .....	16
2.5 Methods.....	17
3. A short History of the Raw Milk Debate.....	20
4. Theory and Analysis.....	30
4.1 The shift from power over death to power over life .....	30
4.2 Foucault's account of the transformation of 'the body': .....	31
4.3 The emergence of two realities .....	36
4.4 Biopower today: the rise of neoliberalism and questions of circulation.....	55
5. The Emergence and Re-conceptualization of Food Sovereignty in the Raw Milk Movement as a Means of Resisting Biopower .....	64
6. Conclusion .....	78
References .....	82

## 1. Introduction

We are living in precarious times when it comes to our health, with the World Health Organization (WHO) expecting cancer cases to rise up to 70% worldwide during the course of the next twenty years (The Guardian 2014) and cancer remaining the second leading cause of death in the United States, after heart disease which takes the number one spot (CDC Website), individuals are getting more involved when it comes to maintaining their health. This is also due to the threatening nature of these statistics, coupled with the fact that there is no absolute cure, with the WHO only citing *healthy lifestyles* as a means of reducing the individual's risk of getting cancer. The threat of cancer (and a variety of other diseases) has led to the spark of food movements in the United States, in which many have positioned their health as a top priority and the right type of food as a means of achieving optimal health. The rise of diseases such as cancer is a complex issue to say the least, and the rise of these types of diseases rely on multiple variables such as detection, increase in life expectancy and other variables which the scope of this investigation does not allow the discussion of. However, among the individuals who now fear cancer, the statistics presented by the WHO are enough to scare them into living healthy lives, just so they have a chance of not getting this horrible disease.

The interesting aspect of these movements is that they have increasingly put the blame on biotech corporations and other multinational corporations for including chemicals in their foods, which they claim have led to the increase in cases of cancer and other diseases, such as in the case of rBGH milk, which will be discussed later, or the subway "yoga mat" ingredient *azodicarbonamide* which caused an outrage in social media recently (Time Magazine April 2014). Individuals in these movements have begun to see big corporations as the *perpetrator* by including *dangerous* ingredients in foodstuffs and the United States government as the *enabler* as the Federal Drug Administration (FDA) has approved the use of these ingredients. Thus they are blaming the government for allowing these products to be sold, while simultaneously, adhering to the recommended healthy lifestyles which will reduce their risk of getting cancer (according to government guidelines). In recent years, perhaps the most surprising food movement has emerged in the form of the raw milk movement which relies on their rhetoric that pasteurized milk is the source of multiple health conditions and pure raw milk is subsequently not, and in turn, is responsible for raw milk activists achieving optimal health. The aspect which makes this food movement so intriguing is that their rhetoric is in direct conflict with

US government guidelines which namely securitize raw milk into being a major danger to consumers' health on the grounds that it spreads multiple diseases and infections which in some cases can be fatal. As of 2014, 15 states prohibit the sale of raw milk completely and the remaining 35 allow the sale of raw milk in some form (Digital Journal Website April 2014), however, even in the states in which it is legal to sell raw milk the Federal Drug Administration has enforced its role as the regulator of food products and conducted raids on farmers suspected of either selling raw milk across state lines, which is prohibited in US law, or producing raw milk which is "unsafe" for consumption and distributing it to others (Forbes Magazine 2011), (The Washington Times 2011).

The aim of this study is neither to legitimize the claims of the health benefits of raw milk made by raw milk activists, nor to undermine the health risks of raw milk presented by the US government. Instead the raw milk debate will be studied from a biopolitical perspective, in terms of the exercising and resistance of biopower. The argument which will be made in this Master's Thesis is that the raw milk movement when comprehended as a phenomenon, which in its resistance of US government regulations, laws and guidelines concerning raw milk, is resisting biopower. Furthermore, I will consider the concept of food sovereignty which emerged in the La Via Campesina debates as a means of protecting peasants' and farmers' food systems in Latin America from multinational corporations and international trade and how academics have attempted to conceptualize food sovereignty as it emerges in food movements as a means of resisting neoliberalism. However, I will question the validity of the arguments presented by these academics, and instead argue that in their quest to resist neoliberalism through the concept of food sovereignty as presented in food movements, instead they are simply reproducing neoliberal forms of governmentality, which in turn means that food sovereignty cannot be used as a means of resisting neoliberalism. Instead I will argue that food sovereignty can be used as a means of resisting biopower, albeit it needs to be re-conceptualized so that it does not fall into the trap of reproducing neoliberal governmentality. I base my argument on the raw milk movement, in which I argue food sovereignty emerges and is re-conceptualized as a means of resisting biopower and also as a means of challenging neoliberal governmentality.

## 2. Background

### 2.1 Previous Research

Foucault's work on biopolitics has revealed the complexities of biopower, and subsequently, the complexities of resistance. Although he is infamously quoted as saying where there is power there is resistance in the *The History of Sexuality Volume One*, Foucault's work remained unfinished when it came to the matter of resistance, this leaves a complex space which needs to be filled by those who continue to try to conceptualize a means of resisting biopower and neoliberal governmentality. However, articulating forms of resistance which are free of neoliberalism has proved to be challenging and arguably too many who attempt to articulate resistance of biopower and subsequently neoliberalism in their work, fail to escape the framework of neoliberalism and instead reaffirm neoliberal forms of governmentality by employing for example, human rights, consumer behavior and judicial and policy change as a means of resistance. This in turn leads to them being stuck in the circle of neoliberalism, where they are trying to resist neoliberalism by reproducing neoliberal governmentality, and so the cycle goes on and on.

Arguably, we need to re-imagine resistance and take a more radical approach in order to find something truly free of neoliberalism and neoliberal biopower. Furthermore, we need to pay attention to forms of resistance at the micro-level instead of trying to conceptualize resistance on the macro scale. This approach needs to be engineered so that it carefully considers the dangers of falling into the trap of reproducing neoliberalism and finds small victories of resistance free of neoliberalism on the micro level, before even contemplating a world “free” of neoliberalism, and this latter suggestion is an issue which is perhaps doomed to become an infinite complex debate on whether or not that is even the objective.

Food movements have been largely discredited as a means of resistance as they often tend to reproduce neoliberal forms, while, claiming to be resisting neoliberalism. A growing number of scholars who recently presented their papers at the conference *Food Sovereignty: A Critical Dialogue* which was held at Yale University in September of 2013, have tried to conceptualize food sovereignty as a means of resistance. Although only one of them attempts to do this within the framework of

biopolitics, the others rely on the conceptualization of food sovereignty within the agrarian movement La Via Campesina as a means of resisting neoliberalism. However, after great depth in researching these I have made the conclusion that none of these papers succeed in conceptualizing food sovereignty as a means of resisting neoliberalism and subsequently, biopower. Instead they are almost systematically trapped in neoliberalism as the means of resistance articulated in their claims of resistance simply reproduces neoliberal forms of resistance, therefore in order for food sovereignty to act as a means of resisting neoliberalism and subsequently biopower, it needs to be freed from neoliberalism—it needs to be re-conceptualized into something new. In this thesis, I will argue that food sovereignty emerges and is re-conceptualized in the raw milk movement as a means of resisting biopower. However, before I attempt to do so I will account for the previous research regarding these matters.

Julie Guntham in her article *Neoliberalism and the making of food politics in California*, argues that food movements are simultaneously claiming to resist neoliberalism, yet at the same time reproducing it. She maintains that food movements which claim to resist neoliberal practices base their claims on what she deems “standard” neoliberal forms such as localism and consumer choice (Guntham 2008, 1174). She criticizes the local food movement in California, for claiming to resist globalization and favor local products in order to protect local agriculture, which Guntham deems to be simply a means of disguising protectionism within the local food movement. Guntham emphasizes that California is one of the largest agricultural producers and exporters of the United States after all. Furthermore, she criticizes food movements for trying to enact change through their consumer patterns and concludes that these movements are trapped in neoliberalism, and suggests that food movements are simply contributing to the shaping of neoliberal subjects. Guntham concludes her article by offering an account of the “politics of the possible” which entails concentrating on micro phenomenon’s in food movements which perhaps have the possibility of not falling into the same cycle of reproducing neoliberalism (Guntham 2008, 1171).

In 1980, Richard Crawford published *Healthism and the medicalization of everyday life* in which he argued that as a result of the new consciousness of health and the rise of health movements the problem of health is continually construed as a problem of the individual. Nikolas Rose in his book *Powers of Freedom: reframing political thought* draws from Foucault's notions of governmentality and argues through what he deems “ethico-politics” that ‘...concerns itself with the self-techniques



necessary for responsible self-government and the relations between one's obligation to oneself and one's obligations to others' (Rose 1999, 188). Rose identifies Healthism as one of these 'self-techniques'.

Individuals are now addressed on the assumption that they want to 'better' their health and ensure their well-being through 'healthy behavior' which is illustrated in individuals who go to the gym and work to maintain their health, and food movements with advocates seeking the most healthiest of foods. This in turn, also acts as a means to reaffirm the public objective of a healthy population, thus through Healthism individuals' exercise self-governance, and by taking care of themselves they are taking care of society as a whole (Rose 1999, 86, 87 & 94). Subsequently, food movements have been criticized for reproducing neoliberal governmentality in the form of reproducing Healthism. Healthism is also been a source of an array of criticisms in the field of biopolitics as being a biopolitical technique. See for example, Lebasco, Kathleen (2011) *Neoliberalism, Public Health and the Moral Perils of Fatness*, Rich, Emma (2011) *I see her being obesed!': Public Pedagogy, Reality Media and the Obesity Crisis*, and Rysst, Mari (2010) *"Healthism" and Looking Good: Body Ideals and Body Practices in Norway*.

If we now consider the concept of food sovereignty as discussed in the papers of participants of the conference *Food Sovereignty: A Critical Dialogue* which was held at Yale University in September of 2013, and the ways in which they attempt to construct valid argumentations on the grounds of food sovereignty being a means to resist neoliberalism. Alison Alkon in her paper *Food Justice, Food Sovereignty, and the Challenge of Neoliberalism* criticizes food movements as reproducing neoliberalism by pursuing what she calls a "market as movement" approach under which food activists are trying to pursue change through their consumer choices. She attempts to illustrate an alternative view of some other food activist's organizations which according to her, go beyond neoliberalism and the "market as movement" model, and therefore, she reaffirms the concept of food sovereignty as a means of resisting neoliberalism, instead of reproducing it. However, Alkon's inspiring goals do not manage to meet her aims, as she does not employ biopolitics in her argument, although at one point she does mention "bio-political disciplining of the self" (Alkon 2013, 2) however, it is soon clear that she does not have any familiarity with biopolitics, therefore her argument that food sovereignty is a means of resisting neoliberalism soon proves to be invalid.

Alkon, like all of the other scholars who have discussed food sovereignty is guilty of trying to formulate food sovereignty as a means of resisting neoliberalism, on the grounds of other neoliberal forms, thus food sovereignty becomes trapped in neoliberalism. Alkon uses examples of what she deems forms of activism which do not reproduce neoliberalism, which are those of workers' rights, human rights and her final example concerns anti-GMO activists demanding the government to take responsibility of the public's health by banning GMOs. The theoretical framework of this investigation consists of Foucauldian biopolitics, thus, those whom also critique his work will be considered. Lois McNay's *Self as Enterprise: Dilemmas of Control and Resistance in Foucault's The Birth of Biopolitics* serves as very useful when reading Foucault's *The Birth of Biopolitics*. McNay criticizes Foucault's conception of Self as Enterprise as individual autonomy becomes merely another political technique of neoliberal governance, disguised as freedom, yet simultaneously, reaffirming neoliberalism—and essentially lies at the heart of neoliberal disciplinary control (McNay 2009, 62). She also argues that as Foucault maintains that rights are subjected to normalization and thus become normalized then they cannot constitute resistance as they too will fall into the category of freedom, which lies at the heart of neoliberal disciplinary control (McNay 2009, 70).

In relation to this if we consider Alkon's arguments that food sovereignty succeeds in resisting neoliberalism which she verifies by using examples of an activist group which seeks better workers' rights—paralleling human rights, then she herself is simply stating freedoms which are at the core of neoliberal governmentality, and subsequently the discipline of neoliberalism. Furthermore, her final notion that anti-GMO activists are challenging neoliberalism by challenging large agribusiness corporations on the grounds that they are demanding the state to take action and “prioritize human and environmental health”(Alkon 2013, 18) means that the power and authority of the health of the individuals is handed over to the state, which in turn reaffirms the position of the state as “protector” of public health, which obviously when we consider the struggle of raw milk activists against this position, then this argument also becomes rather problematic.

Priscilla Claeys in her conference paper *From Food Sovereignty to Peasants' Rights: an Overview of La Via Campesina's Rights-based Claims over the last 20 years* explains that the ‘...transnational agrarian movement La Via Campesina is known for having successfully mobilized a human rights discourse in its struggle against capitalism and neoliberalism in agriculture’ (Claeys 2013, 1). Claeys in turn, aims to explain how the movement has utilized human rights in order to express its claims

(Claeys 2013, 1). In conclusion, she argues that food sovereignty could become a new human right. Once again, Claeys is trying to position resistance to neoliberalism within the framework of neoliberalism by using neoliberal freedoms in the form of human rights, which in turn, are as McNay argued, at the heart of neoliberal disciplinary control.

Annette Desmarais and Hannah Whitman in their paper *Farmers, Foodies and First World Nations: Getting to Food Sovereignty in Canada* consider what food sovereignty could mean for Canadian farmers, “foodies” and indigenous peoples. Although Desmarais and Whitman draw on La Via Campesina's conception of food sovereignty as a means of illustrating an alternative to neoliberal agricultural policies and fundamentally, resisting neoliberalism, instead they try to conceptualize food sovereignty as becoming a part of national policy in Canada. They understand food sovereignty as being '...a set of goals comprised of protecting community, livelihoods and social and environmental sustainability in the production, consumption and distribution of nutritious and culturally appropriate food' (Desmarais and Whitman 2013, 3) and therefore, try to conceptualize food sovereignty as a means of protecting farmers rights and furthermore, indigenous rights.

However, the protection of farmers' rights mostly entails protecting them against “big business” and international trade agreements, which could be harmful for their livelihoods. Therefore, this becomes another instance of localism—with food sovereignty becoming a means of sheltering protectionist measures. Desmarais and Whitman then similarly to Claeys, try to conceptualize food sovereignty in the framework of human rights with organizations trying to illustrate how there are human right concerns, especially surrounding food security and indigenous rights concerning access to food, related to the industrial food system, coupled with insufficient social policies in Canada, these concerns in turn are sheltered under the umbrella of food sovereignty (Desmarais & Whitman 2013, 18). Evidently, the purpose of Desmarais's and Whitman's paper is not to articulate food sovereignty as a means of resisting neoliberalism, instead the interest is implementing food sovereignty into social policy. In this respect there has been some “success” because the UN has adopted food sovereignty in relation to indigenous peoples' rights. However, this pretty much seals the deal that the current conceptualization of food sovereignty cannot act as a means of resisting neoliberalism.

Hilda Kurtz is perhaps the first to try to conceptualize food sovereignty in biopolitical terms as a means of resisting biopower. In her paper *Scaling Biopolitics: Enacting Food Sovereignty in Maine*

(USA) it is stated that Kurtz is working in collaboration with Heather Retberg and Bonnie Preston, which is why, in this investigation, I will single out Kurtz as the primary author, and thus will reference her when discussing the article. Furthermore, it is stated at the end of the paper that 'Heather Retberg and Bonnie Preston are founding members of Local Food Rules, the organization formed to foster broadening support for the local food and community self-governance ordinances' and subsequently that Hilda Kurtz is writing a book on this subject, therefore, I think it is fair to credit Kurtz as the primary author.

The paper attempts to argue that the “food sovereigntists of Maine”, in their Local Food and Community Self-Governance Ordinance “face off” biopower. Thus Kurtz is articulating the Ordinance as a means of resisting biopower. The reasons why she thinks of the Ordinance in biopolitical terms is because of two law suits concerning a raw milk activist's plea to be able to sell and produce raw milk. Subsequently, Hilda Kurtz's work on food sovereignty is used quite extensively in this investigation, as she has tried to link raw milk activism, food sovereignty and biopolitics. However, I had fundamental difficulties with her work which led me to conclude that her arguments were invalid, which I will discuss extensively in my analysis.

Kurtz has opted to use biopolitics in her work, yet she has not taken the time to gather in depth understanding of Foucault's notions of biopolitics, and instead often only cites him via other people's work. Furthermore, her work suffers from many blunders as a result of her limited, or perhaps non-existent understanding of Foucault's work on the *Self as Enterprise* in the *Birth of Biopolitics*. Kurtz's ignorance of Foucault's notions of biopolitics, makes her arguments, in my opinion, invalid as it shines through that she has not taken the time to gain an in depth understanding of the complexities which form Foucault's notion of biopolitics. Instead she relies on the work of neo-foucauldians such as Nicholas Rose, however, this leads her to make statements concerning biopolitics which are either, not necessarily true, or are not backed up with any references, as in the case of her claim which she makes in her abstract that 'The paper traces how the food sovereigntists of Maine use politics of scale to face off against biopower as exercised through corporate influence over food and farm regulations', in which she is insinuating that biopower is exercised by corporations, or corporate influence as she maintains. However, she does not back this view up at any point in the paper. I even found an example from Hardt and Negri which would have substantiated her claims, however, Kurtz does not reference anyone regarding

this claim, and instead assumes it to be a fact.

I have also read another article written by Hilda Kurtz: *The contested terrain of biological citizenship in the seizure of raw milk in Athens, Georgia*, which also attempt to discuss the raw milk movement in the framework of biopolitics, however, this article did not prove to be useful for my work. Instead I have used the article to point out other difficulties in Kurtz's work, as for the fact that in the Geoforum article Kurtz and the other authors all confess to being a part of the raw milk movement, with one of them subsequently drinking raw milk frequently. Due to my prior knowledge of Kurtz professed activism, I found quite a few blunders in her work. The fact that Kurtz uses David Gumbert as a credible source, is something which I have a fundamental issue with, as I myself have opted not to use his work, as he is an avid raw milk activist and his book *The Raw Milk Revolution: Behind America's Emerging Struggle Over Food Rights* is more of a guide to drinking raw milk, then a credible source, which has in my opinion, no place in academic writing. Furthermore, Kurtz does not even disclose this information concerning Gumpert's background but instead casually uses him as a reference for facts, this is something which I find to be very problematic.

Another problem which I find with Kurtz's list of sources is that she only has referenced two of Foucault's books: *the Birth of Biopolitics* and *Society must be defended*. Kurtz at best touches on Foucault's work, without having an in depth understanding of for example, how extensively the matter of health was discussed in his other work, and how the health of the population emerged to be a concern of the state, coupled with the medicalization of the family and so on, and I think this is evident in her lack of Foucault's work in her sources. I have rendered Kurtz's work to be invalid, not only due to her ignorance when it comes to Foucauldian biopolitics, but because she too is stuck in the cycle of neoliberalism, trying to resist it by simply reproducing it, examples of this will be made in the analysis. However, this does not mean that the concept of food sovereignty does not have the potential to become a means of resisting neoliberalism and subsequently, biopower. I propose that in my research of the raw milk debate between raw milk activists and the US government, food sovereignty does indeed emerge as a means of resisting neoliberalism and biopower. The reason it can serve as a means of resistance is that it is *re-conceptualized* and no longer suffers from the problem of being simply a means of reproducing biopower and neoliberal governmentality.

## 2.2 Research Questions

My research problem is:

*In which ways does food sovereignty emerge in the raw milk movement and in turn, is re-conceptualized as a means of resisting biopower*

In order to solve this problem I will conduct a discourse analysis of material consisting of FDA and CDC educational films, and raw milk activists' testimonials and interviews.

Supporting questions:

*In which ways do the US governmental institutions the FDA and the CDC securitize raw milk into being a health threat, and in turn, in which ways do raw milk activists justify their consumption of raw milk on the grounds of their health?*

*In which ways does the current definition of food sovereignty fail as a means of resisting neoliberalism and subsequently, biopower?*

*In which ways do current discourses surrounding food movements as resisting neoliberalism instead only reproduce neoliberal governmentality?*

## 2.3 Theoretical Framework

I am using Foucauldian biopolitics as my theoretical framework, drawing on his notions of governmentality and biopower. By drawing on Foucault I will argue that biopower is being exercised through the guidelines regarding raw milk issued by the US governmental organizations such as the Federal Drug Administration (FDA) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Furthermore, I will argue that raw milk activists are resisting this biopower by drinking raw milk. I will also draw on Foucault's work regarding circulation and suggest how other aspects of the raw milk movement disrupt this circulation, and thus disrupt or even resist neoliberal governmentality.

## 2.4 Material

The material which I have chosen to use as my primary data comprises of two educational films from United States governmental organizations websites about raw milk and testimonials from raw milk activist websites, as well as, interviews from raw milk activist film *Farmageddon* (2011). I opted to use just four educational films from the Federal Drug Administration's (FDA) website and the website of The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), as they conceptualize the position of the US government on the consumption of raw milk quite succinctly.

The material which I chose to use from the raw milk activist's websites was also initially quite substantial, however, after limiting my material as much as I felt that I possibly could, I still have used a lot more material on the raw milk activists' side, in comparison to the material used from US governmental websites. However, I feel that this is justified due to the different nature of the activists and governmental institutions. The views presented by the FDA and CDC are absolute—they are policy and serve to articulate the government's position on this matter. The raw milk activists' material in turn, serves a different purpose and serves to connote an array of issues surrounding the raw milk movement.

### 2.4.1 The US Governmental Organizations Material

The Federal Drug Administration (FDA) on its website, states that it is *responsible* for 'protecting the public health' (FDA Website) through various measures. These measures range from tobacco, medical and cosmetic regulation to more importantly foodstuffs. The FDA asserts that they are 'protecting' the public health by 'assuring foods—are safe, wholesome, sanitary and properly labeled' (FDA Website).

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) has the role of 'Saving lives, Protecting People' (CDC Website). The 'mission' of the CDC is to protect the American people from 'health, safety and security threats' (CDC Website), in addition, the CDC 'fights disease and supports communities and citizens to do the same' (CDC Website).

The sections of the FDA and CDC websites on raw milk serve to articulate the position of the government when it comes to the consumption of raw milk.

### 2.4.2 The Raw Milk Activist Material

The Real Milk website is the website for the “Real Milk” campaign which is a project of the Weston A. Price foundation. The Weston A. Price foundation is '...a nonprofit, tax-exempt nutrition education foundation' (The Weston A. Price Website). The goal of the campaign is '...universal access to clean raw whole milk from pasture-fed cows, especially access for pregnant and nursing mothers and for babies and growing children' (Real Milk Website). Subsequently, the website offers for example, information about the health benefits of raw milk, and testimonials on behalf of raw milk. I have used seven testimonials from the Real Milk Website.

The Rejoice in Life Website is an Australian based website advocating alternative medicine and health care. Although it is based in Australia, it has become an outlet for raw milk activists in the United States to produce their testimonials on behalf of raw milk. I have used three testimonials from the website.

Farmageddon is a raw milk activist film produced by Kristin Canty. The film according to the Farmageddon Website '...tells the story of small, family farmers providing safe, healthy foods to their communities who were forced to stop, often through violent action, by agents of misguided government bureaucracies. The movie succinctly poses and addresses the question “why is this happening in 21<sup>st</sup> century America?”’ (Farmageddon Website). Subsequently, the film contains a variety of interviews with raw milk activists. As the film is an activist film it serves to articulate their position on raw milk, which is why, coupled with the one-on-one interviews with raw milk activists, it works well as material for this investigation.

### 2.4.3 Material Key

(FDA1) = FDA Website, “About”.

(FDA2)= FDA Video “The Dangers of Unpasteurized Milk”.

(CDC1)=CDC Website, “Mission”.

(CDC2)=CDC Website “Real stories of the dangers of raw milk”.

(RM1)= Real Milk Website Raw Milk Testimonials.



(RM2)=Real Milk Website News “Raw Milk Drinker Tells Government to Stay Out of the Kitchen”.

(RIL1)= Rejoice in Life Website Raw Milk Testimonials.

(F1)= Farmageddon documentary 2011.

## 2.5 Methods

The methodology of this investigation consists of a discourse analysis of testimonials and interviews of raw milk activists from activists' websites and a raw milk activist film and of educational films produced by the United States governmental organizations: the Federal Drug Administration and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Discourse analysis is a relatively new form of qualitative research which in the academic community generally is agreed to be a fluid concept, as James Paul Gee, in his book *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis. Theory and Method* asserts '...there are many different approaches to discourse, none of them, including this one, uniquely “right” (Gee 2001, 5). Marianne Jorgensen and Louise J. Phillips join Gee remarking that '...it is used indiscriminately, often without being defined' (Jorgensen & Phillips 2002, 1). However complex a method, discourse analysis is generally understood to mean the '... study of language, in the everyday sense in which most people use the term' (Johnstone 2002, 2), with the emphasis being on this '... analysis of language as it is used to enact activities, perspectives, and identities (Gee 2001, 4). The ways in which language is structured to create meanings by individuals reflects on people's participation in different areas of social life, thus discourses emerge as for example, political discourse, discourse analysis then analyzes these patterns which form the discourse (Jorgensen & Phillips 2002, 1). However, discourse analysis is not simply a form of an analysis of linguistics but moreover focuses on the meanings of texts, or the meaning which is conveyed through language (Given 2008, 216).

Michel Foucault has been instrumental in the evolution of discourse analysis and as Jorgensen and Phillips concisely observe, '...has become a figure to quote, relate to, comment on, modify and criticise' (Jorgensen & Phillips 2002, 12). However, others note that although Foucault's influence in the development of discourse analysis has been significant, in itself it does not form a method (Given 2008, 218). Moreover Foucauldian Discourse Analysis, as it is called, was developed by those who were influenced by Foucault's work, as for example, Foucault himself did not analyze interviews, furthermore, there is speculation on whether Foucault would have approved of the current form of discourse analysis which carries his name (Given 2008, 219). Thus there is a lot of suspicion

surrounding Foucauldian Discourse Analysis with some even questioning its existence all together (Graham 2005, 2).

Be that as it may, there are scholars who are actively employing Foucauldian Discourse Analysis in their work, which as some often criticizes poses some dangers if they do not have a complete understanding of Foucault. However, as Foucault's work also formulated the theoretical framework of this investigation, arguably there are grounds to loosely employ Foucauldian Discourse Analysis or Foucauldian understanding of discourse in the material chosen for this investigation.

A Foucauldian Discourse Analysis focuses on power and how it is employed through language, furthermore, this focus pays particular attention to '...how historically and socially instituted sources of power construct the wider social world through language' (Given 2008, 217). Those who have been influenced by Foucault in some cases understand discourse as a plural form of discourses, which constitute manners of talking which in turn create manners of thinking, and the link between the two formulate ideologies (Johnstone 2002, 3). These ideologies or '—sets of interrelated ideas—serve to circulate power in society' (Johnstone 2002, 3). Therefore, discourses include belief patterns, recurring actions and recurring language patterns (Johnstone 2002, 3). Foucault himself understood discourse as a “set of statements” taking a more sociological and philosophical stance, this set of statements would in turn construct subjects and objects, with for example the object being a disease and the subject being the identity of the doctor who will identify the disease, through their knowledge and authority (Given 2008, 218). Thus his work would have aspired to determine discursive practices which would account for historically significant discourses which evolved for example, within the field of medicine, which shaped normative conceptions of disease and those who were healthy or ill (Given 2008, 218). Although the discourse analysis which is conducted in this investigation will not strictly adhere to any precisely defined form of discourse analysis, aspects of Foucauldian Discourse Analysis or moreover, Foucauldian understandings of discourse, will loosely be incorporated in the analysis, as the primary function of the “texts” used as material, serve to exercise power on the one hand, and resist power on the other.

In conducting discourse analysis in general it is important to take certain measures into account. For example, in this investigation the material which is used consists of both written and non-written discourse, which subsequently can both be referred to as “texts” (Johnstone 2002, 19). The use of

non-written discourse can be dangerous in discourse analysis as the analyst themselves in a sense become a “tool” immersed within the discourse, thus when non-written discourse is transcribed there is a danger that the analyst will impose characteristics onto the material (Johnstone 2002, 19). Thus the analyst’s decisions concerning the ways in which these types of texts are “entextualized” which entail omitting certain aspects of the texts and drawing boundaries, will have consequences for the conclusions drawn from the material (Johnstone 2002, 19). For these reasons when employing discourse analysis one must retain a sense of critique towards the analysis and be sensitive to these dangers which are inherent when transcribing certain non-written texts, but also in the case of written texts (Johnstone 2002, 26).

In this investigation, material is used which is subject to the dangers previously discussed, subsequently a short discussion of the material will now follow. It is important to keep in mind that the aims of the US governmental organizations educational films and similarly the raw milk activist material is to *persuade*. Obviously persuasion can arguably be attributed to be the aim of virtually all texts, yet due to the nature of the subject which is studied in this investigation, that of the exertion of biopower and resistance of biopower, in the form of exerting guidelines concerning the consumption of raw milk on the part of the US government, and resisting these guidelines and exerting an alternative reality on the part of the raw milk activists, the extent of persuasion becomes rather extreme. Subsequently, there is a danger that it may appear that certain aspects of the material are omitted in order to construct an overtly comical account of both sides, as the language which is employed is extremely hyperbolic. However, after beginning with an extensive amount of material, which was narrowed down due to the fact that it was very repetitive what emerges is that the hyperbole employed by both parties simply illustrates how strongly both sides feel about the matter of drinking raw milk. The US governmental organizations will use strong language in order to securitize raw milk, as the government genuinely considers it to be a threat to public health. The raw milk activists, in turn, employ strong language to not only resist the government’s view that raw milk is dangerous for their health, but they will subsequently use language to securitize the pasteurization of milk as a danger to their health. Thus although there is a danger that the material which has been used may come across in a slightly comical tone, it is important to recognize that powerful language must be employed when power is being exerted and resisted; challenged and transformed.

### 3. A short History of the Raw Milk Debate

In this investigation it is not possible to go into an extensive history of milk in the United States throughout time, instead, I am interested in the point when raw milk came to be associated with various health risks, thus I will draw the line of the history at around the final decades of the nineteenth century. The politics surrounding the raw and pasteurized milk debate dates back to the time when the process of pasteurizing was invented in France in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century by Louis Pasteur. Pasteur found that by heating liquids to low temperatures such as 60c it was possible to kill harmful bacteria, without having to completely sterilize the liquids. It was originally intended for wine but soon was used on milk. (Holsinger, V.H.; Rajkowski, K. T. & Stabel, J.R. 1997, 411). Thus with the process of Pasteurization, what was previously referred to as just milk was now termed raw milk, and the distinction between raw milk and pasteurized milk was made. The new invention started to spread across the world and it became somewhat controversial, especially in the US.

In the history of the milk debate, high infant mortality associated with drinking milk is often cited as one of the main reasons for why there was such a need for the pasteurization of milk. Milk, which had incidentally been consumed by children and adults for centuries before. Of course, previously the process of pasteurization had not been available therefore that was not an alternative when it came to producing “safe” milk. Perhaps one of the reasons for the rapid infant mortality rate linked to drinking milk was due to the nature of the time. It was during the industrial revolution after all and there was a rapid influx of people moving into the cities and subsequently, away from the countryside, where they would previously have had access to fresh milk locally or even had their own milking cow. Peter G. Goheen in his article *Industrialization and the growth of cities in nineteenth century America*, accounts that 'the highest rate of increase of urban population recorded in the United States occurred between 1840 and 1850; the figure for this decade was 99 percent.' (Goheen 1996, 50). As people moved into cities, with them came the rapid demand for foodstuffs, including milk, and subsequently, as cities continued to grow, due to poor living conditions so did the rapid spread of disease. The rapid urbanization of the 1800s is what led to the birth of the dairy in the United States, as 'until the mid 1850s, the dairy industry in America revolved around the family-owned dairy cow, with little sales of milk or other dairy products outside the family' (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2012). Subsequently, the birth of the dairy, as a result of urbanization, coincides with raw milk becoming a

health risk. This is the turning point when milk started to be conceived as something unsafe, as its production was increasingly taken out of the hands of the family, and put through a process of manufacturing milk which entailed many risks, especially when it came to the transportation of dairy products.

In an article published in the New York Times in 1874, concerns about the safety of milk were being raised especially due to a growing practice of the “adulteration” of milk. The article reports how this practice had previously been considered ‘...as a harmless process rather in the nature of dilution, and the agent employed invariably assumed to be water.’ (The New York Times 1874) However, as the article soon reveals this was far from what had actually been going on in the adulteration of milk, among other ingredients the reporter explains: ‘to remove the sky-blue color, and improve the flavor of the diluted article, dealers found it necessary to add a little molasses to sweeten it, salt to heighten its flavor, and annatto to improve its color. In addition to these substances, chalk, starch, and the brains of different animals were frequently employed to improve the general appearance of the milk (The New York Times 1874). Subsequently, it is not odd that the reporter quotes a Dr. Draper whom equates adulterated milk to poison when given to infants (The New York Times 1874). The adulteration of milk was not the only matter affecting milk in New York City in 1874, as the article later exposes the process which was undergone on Long Island where the reporter reveals how ‘...cows are frequently fed upon the reuse of breweries and distilleries, or with brewers’ grain’ (The New York times 1874), as a result, the cows became “horribly diseased” and their milk was deemed to be ‘...one of the most dangerous that can be used (The New York Times 1874).

Although milk related diseases and contamination were also a problem for the family milking cow, the shift in milk production from the family-owned dairy cow to the dairies led to the contamination of milk on a large scale and thus it affected a much larger chunk of the population. Consequently, the so-called poisonous milk, discussed in the 1874 New York Times article, was being linked to infants under the age of five having the highest mortality rate in New York City in 1874 (The New York Times 1874). Thus milk began to be conceived of more as a health threat rather than a good source of nutrition. Milk was now a concern for parents, who started to take measures of their own to guarantee the safety of the milk their children were consuming. These measures often entailed boiling the milk before its ingestion. Therefore, even before Pasteur's pasteurization became widespread there was a practice of heating milk in order to kill off disease before ingestion. In another article in the

New York Times published twelve years later in 1886 it was suggested that '...it would be prudent to boil milk, if not always at least in all cases of doubt' (The New York Times 1886).

During the late nineteenth and early twentieth century the United States was facing various epidemics of diseases which were in particularly dangerous and in some cases fatal for infants, and were subsequently, in most cases spread by infected raw milk. One of the prevalent diseases affecting children which was believed to be spread by raw milk was Scarlet Fever. It is referred to in the 1886 New York Times article as 'The germ of the disease most threatening to childhood has been seen, but its antidote has not been found' (The New York Times 1886), which is why the article encouraged the boiling of milk. In the book *Human Biologists in the Archives: demography, health, nutrition and genetics in historical populations* an article by Alan C. Swedlund and Alison K. Donta, *Scarlet fever epidemics of the nineteenth century: a case of evolved pathogenic virulence*, discusses the Scarlet Fever epidemic of the time. Swedlund and Donta remark that '...a common source of the bacteria in historical outbreaks was unpasteurized milk handled by infected dairy workers' (Swedlund & Donta 2003, 159), with small children being at the highest risk of developing scarlet fever (Swedlund & Donta 2003, 159).

As a result of raw milk being the source of spreading a vast amount of diseases which in addition to Scarlet Fever included, tuberculosis, diphtheria and typhoid fever (Ward & Warren 2006, 25), pasteurization was adopted '...in the United States as early as 1893, when private charity milk stations in New York City began to provide pasteurized milk to poor children through the city health department, a movement that spread to other cities' (Ward & Warren 2006, 25). As it was the urban poor who were most affected by the spread of infected raw milk from the urban dairies it was the hope of public health officials that pasteurization would eradicate the deaths of especially poor children who were most affected by the raw milk problem (Smith-Howard 2014, 32).

However, pasteurization was not embraced by everyone with open arms, and there was a great number of doctors and farmers who were skeptical about pasteurized milk. It was already believed by some doctors in the late nineteenth century that the boiling of milk potentially could cause health problems as in the case of a study conducted in 1884 in which it was found that '... milk was more readily digested when raw than when boiled' (Randolph 1884, 120), furthermore, the study concluded that '...the residue found in the stomachs of those persons receiving boiled milk was greater than the

similar residue found in the stomachs where raw milk' (Randolph 1884, 120). Physicians argued that the heating of milk '...killed not only pathogenic bacteria but also the lactic acid bacteria believed to be beneficial to digestion' (Smith-Howard 2014, 32). The new process of pasteurization was met with a lot of opposition from the medical community because of a strong belief that raw milk was fundamentally healthier than pasteurized milk. Attention was also paid to giving infants pasteurized milk as in '...1912, over half of pediatricians surveyed by the American Pediatric Society believed "babies did not thrive well of pasteurized milk and that such milk could lead to infant digestive disorders"' (Smith-Howard, 2014, 32).

In 1916 an article was published in *The Journal of Infectious Diseases* titled *Comparison of the Rate of Multiplication of Bacteria in Raw Milk with the Rate in Pasteurized Milk* by P.W. Allen, in which Allen compared how bacteria increased in pasteurized milk and raw milk. Allen came to the conclusion that 'raw milk as compared with pasteurized milk exerts a powerful suppressing influence on the multiplication of certain bacteria' (Allen 1916, 728) as well as, that 'after pasteurization the organisms which remain in the milk and those which are able to get into the milk find conditions more favorable for their rapid multiplication than before pasteurization' (Allen 1916, 728). Thus Allen believed that raw milk was healthier than pasteurized milk. These examples illustrate how at the time, physicians and scientists were persistent in their belief that raw milk was healthier than pasteurized milk, coupled with their fears that pasteurized milk would cause other health issues later on, such as digestive problems.

The milk epidemic in cities of the late nineteenth century and in particularly the high rate of infant mortality, coupled with the Scarlet fever epidemic, led to milk regulations reaching every part of the United States by 1920 (Weisbecker 2007, 62). However, the new regulations were not without opposition as 'milk producers and sellers attacked the first regulations as unconstitutional and unwarranted governmental limitations on their rights to produce and sell their products as they wished' (Weisbecker 2007, 62). Around the same time with the introduction of pasteurization into the United States there was also a lot of fears by parents, who as well as having nutritional concerns of pasteurization, were concerned because of the issues such as the adulteration of milk in the late nineteenth century. They feared that pasteurization '...might be used to market dirtier milk and that it might affect the nutritional value of milk' (Ward & Warren 2006, 25). As a consequence of these common fears there was a movement to promote unpasteurized milk as long as the conditions under

which it was produced were strictly supervised. It was believed by many that '...the best way to prevent milk-associated diseases was through scrupulous attention to animal health and to clean milk production, which could be supported by an on-farm inspection and certification system' (Ward & Warren 2006, 25).

The beginning of the twentieth century then saw the process of pasteurization and certification both being practiced separately in order to maintain milk safety. As a result of the successes of these practices US state and city officials issued various milk ordinances with 'the first pasteurised milk ordinance...published in 1924' (Holsinger, V.H., Rajkowski, K.t. & Stabel, J.R. 1997, 442). However, prior to the 1924 ordinance there were previous ordinances which allowed the sale of certified milk but which required a permit for the sale of both certified and pasteurized milk.

In the early 1920s various milk ordinances cases were taken to the Supreme Court by farmers and milk dealers. In Milwaukee a milk ordinance was issued in which it was required '...that all milk sold in the city shall be pasteurized, except certified milk and milk from tuberculin-tested cows' (Public Health Reports 1920, 1801) this was then attacked by farmers and milk dealers and taken to the supreme court, however the ordinance was upheld on the grounds of '...the protection of health of the people' (Public Health Reports 1920, 1801). A similar case was taken to the Supreme Court of North Carolina against the city of Charlotte's milk ordinance which required farmers and milk dealers to buy a permit from health authorities which cost \$1 annually (Public Health Reports 1920, 1801). The defendant who was being tried for selling milk without a license, in his defense maintained that '...the ordinance created a monopoly through the power of the health authorities to revoke permits (Public Health Reports 1920, 1801). Alan Czaplicki remarks, in his article "*Pure Milk is Better Than Purified Milk*" *Pasteurization and Milk Purity in Chicago, 1908-1916*, that pasteurization had '...few outspoken political supporters' (Czaplicki 2007, 411) during the period which he focuses on in his article of 1908-1916. Among the protesters were farmers who owned small farms and feared that the larger dairies would put them out of business (Czaplicki 2007, 416), if pasteurization was demanded of all.

Despite the efforts of farmers, milk dealers and even physicians opposed to pasteurization, certified milk continued to be the source of outbreaks of disease and it was believed that '...dairy hygiene alone was not enough; pasteurization was also needed as a final processing step to guarantee milk safety'



(Ward & Warren 2006, 25). However, the certification system was not completely abandoned and in 1923 the two processes of pasteurization and certification were combined by a public health expert (Ward & Warren 2006, 25). The health official created a standard of pasteurizing milk which was, prior to pasteurization clean enough to be certified, this led to the 1927 National Public Health Service Standard Milk Ordinance (Ward & Warren 2006, 25). The 1927 ordinance would then settle the concerns of parents who feared that pasteurization would be used as a tool for selling dirty milk, and by the 1930s there was a change in tune in the medical community with a 1931 report stating that '...the only effective practical measure for controlling milk-borne streptococcic diseases, as well as, other milk-borne diseases, is efficient pasteurization.' (Williams & Gurley 1931, 256). Farmers also found some appeal in pasteurization because of the longer shelf life of the product (Holsinger, V.H., Rajkowski, K.t. & Stabel, J.R. 1997, 441). In the late 1930s new equipment was introduced which enabled the process of high-temperature short-time (HTST) pasteurization, this standard was then incorporated in the the 1933 United States Public Health Service Milk Ordinance and Code (Holsinger, V.H., Rajkowski, K.t. & Stabel, J.R. 1997, 442). However, even as late as 1938 '...milk-borne diseases were still responsible for about 25% of illnesses associated with infected food and contaminated water' (Holsinger, V.H., Rajkowski, K.t. & Stabel, J.R. 1997, 442).

The period between the late nineteenth century running up to the milk regulations of the 1920s and 1930s saw an interesting transformation in the way milk was conceived from a health threat in the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century to becoming *nature's perfect food* in the 1920s (Smith-Howard 2014, 34). During the First World War the nutritional value of milk was being preached to Americans, and families were even encouraged to eat dairy products instead of wheat and meat. At the same time European allies were benefited by Americans exporting condensed milk to them during the war years (Smith-Howard 2014, 34). In 1918, the tight symbolic relationship between the American people and milk was further emphasized by a pure foods advocate Harvey Wiley who argued that '...access to milk would define Americans' future, writing, "just in proportion as we can supply milk to the children shall we have healthy men and women in the next generation"' (Smith-Howard 2014, 34). Thus milk had completely been transformed from a health threat responsible for the deaths of a large percentage of the infant population, to becoming nature's perfect food and the foundation of producing future strong Americans, and this is because of pasteurization. Subsequently, by 1940s pasteurization '...had become the norm' (Ward & Warren 2006, 25).

The latter half of the twentieth century in comparison with the previous fifty years, saw a relatively quieter time with few milk-borne diseases coupled with the rate of infant mortality associated with milk being very low. However, in the 1950s there was yet again a number of cases of illnesses being spread by milk. The disease responsible was Q fever which was thought to spread when consuming infected raw milk, however, this in turn led to research which illustrated not only that Q fever survived pasteurization but that it was more impervious to heat than *M. tuberculosis*, subsequently, 145°F (around 63°C) became the new requirement for pasteurization (Ward & Warren 2006, 26). This led to tighter regulations and although '...regulation occurred at the local and state level, the Conference of Interstate Milk Shippers developed reciprocal inspection agreements in 1950' (Ward & Warren 2006, 26). One of the interesting characteristics of this body was that unlike before, dairies of any size were being subject to these new regulations (Ward & Warren 2006, 26) the main outcome of these regulations which affected dairies of any size is that today '...99% of fresh milk consumed in the United States is pasteurized Grade A' (Ward & Warren 2006, 26).

Another interesting feature of the period of the 1950s and 60s when it came to milk politics is that it was consumers who were demanding government intervention in milk production. In the '...1950s and 1960s...consumer activists called for congress to enact tougher standards to improve milk's purity and sought to toughen FDA enforcement (Smith-Howard 2014, 160). The grounds to toughen FDA enforcement, provided by the American public at the time is quite ironic when put into context with the raw-milk debate today, as 'citizens saw these public health interventions that restricted individual liberties to be justified through the constitutional principle that grants the state police power to promote the public's general health and well-being' (Smith-Howard 2014, 160). The latter half of the twentieth century also saw the FDA becoming a strong player in food politics with a few notable examples, with the pesticide issues in the 1960s, the contested RGBH campaign in the 1990s and the ongoing raw milk debate today.

In the 1960s milk was once again on the political agenda when dairy farmers began to complain to the US government about the problems they were facing with milk production as a result of cotton farmers using pesticides, as '...drifting pesticides from adjacent cotton farms made it especially difficult to ensure milk's purity' (Smith-Howard 2014, 142). After being unable to sell their dairy products at market because of large quantities of pesticide residues found in their products, Joe Spinks a manager of Borden's Oklona plant in Mississippi (Smith-Howard 2014, 142) did what any American

would do, he wrote to his senator. In a letter to Mississippi Senator Joe Stennis, Joe Spinks explained “We are not fighting the Food and Drug Administration on their testing program because we feel that it is their duty to protect the consuming public. We do feel however that the producers of this milk should be protected from the un-wanted applications of insecticides on his pastures and feed crops” (Smith-Howard 2014, 142). The letter clearly conveys how the farmers still maintain a great trust in the government and government organizations such as the FDA, however, the response which Senator Stennis received from the FDA was that ‘...the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act provided them with no jurisdiction over aerial sprayers’ (Smith-Howard 2014, 142) and thus they would do nothing about the problem of milk which was that it contained so much pesticides from cotton farms that it was unfit to sell at market.

Thirty years later the politics of milk was yet again a contested topic with the issue of Recombinant bovine growth hormone (rBGH) milk and FDA regulations. The hormone is genetically engineered and was the interest of several companies in the 1980s but it was the biotech corporation Monsanto which eventually gained rights to the patent (Bray 2000, 101&102). Scientists claimed that milk production could see a significant and cost-efficient rise with the use of rBGH which they proved when ‘...they injected the synthetically produced hormone into cow's bodies, lengthening cows' lactation periods and increasing the amount of milk the cows yielded’ (Smith-Howard 2014, Epilogue, 148). This was an enticing opportunity for not only Monsanto, but for farmers who would be able to produce a greater amount of milk from one single milking cow. Subsequently, rBGH milk was introduced into retail in 1994, with approximately 30 per cent of dairy production being associated with the rBGH hormone in some form or another, with farmers either giving the hormone to all of their cows or only a selected few (Bray 2000, 101&102).

The introduction of rBGH was met with great opposition from consumers, animal rights activists and traditional farmers. The concerns of its critics varied from animal rights, to fears that the use of the rBGH hormone would leave cows more susceptible to getting mastitis, which in turn would cause greater levels of residues from antibiotics in rBGH milk. In addition, there were fears that rBGH could potentially be the cause of various forms of cancer, after research surfaced which linked rBGH with causing high levels of insulin growth factor (IGF-1), which in turn, were linked to increased levels of various cancers (Smith-Howard 2014, Epilogue, 148) & (Bray 2000,103).

As milk from cows which had been injected with rBGH was allowed in the dairy market in the early

1990s, consumer activists called for milk containing rBGH to be labelled, stating '... consumers had a right to know the contents of their food' (Smith-Howard 2014, 153). However, the biotech corporation Monsanto vigorously fought all labeling efforts on the grounds that there was no difference in the milk produced from cows which had been injected with rBGH and cows which had not (Smith-Howard, 2014, 152). The issue was taken to the FDA who '...rejected a Mandatory requirement that all milk from RBGH-injected cows be labeled' (Smith-Howard 2014, 153) in 1994. Instead, they allowed producers to state that their products did not include rBGH as long as they also clearly stated that there was no proven difference between rBGH milk and milk from cows who had not been injected with rBGH (Smith-Howard 2014, 153).

Subsequently, there was criticism concerning the tests which the FDA conducted comparing rBGH milk and non-rBGH milk, as they were only short-term, coupled with some other controversial features of the testing circumstances (Lynch 2013, 456-457). These aspects of the labeling case left rBGH opponents unconvinced as concerns surrounding rBGH products continued to rise.

In spite of this, the FDA continued to assure rBGH opponents that only a '...small amount of IGF-1 that may be retained after drinking rbGH-enhanced milk, would probably not travel beyond the stomach of the drinker' (Bray 2000, 104). However, the United Nations Food Safety Agency (UNFSA) condemned rBGH to be unsafe "unanimously", when reports confirmed that high levels of insulin-like growth factor one IGF-1 were linked to the use of rBGH and thus the use of rBGH raised significant concerns of cancer. Canada also followed and prohibited rBGH in 1999 (Maheshwari 2012, 2). The use of rBGH is still allowed in the US (Maheshwari 2012,2), this has led to a number of countries which previously bought US dairy and meat products to stop on the grounds of not wanting dairy and meat products which are from livestock which have been injected with rBGH (Bray 2000,104).

The use of rBGH still remains a very controversial issue in the US with many citing how 'real data about rbGH is difficult to come by' (Bray 2000, 102), as the USDA does not publish information about cows injected with rBGH in their Dairy statistics (Bray 2000, 102). The lack of transparency surrounding rBGH milk, coupled with the issue of labeling rBGH milk, has led to a great lack of trust in the dairy industry. Many consumers have turned to organic milk and even raw milk, and the successes of these industries in recent years is argued by some to be '...directly connected with

controversies over rBGH' (Blue 2010, 151).

Over a century later the raw milk debate has once again heated up, and similarly as in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century and early 20<sup>th</sup> century, the raw milk debate is concerned with the main issue of health. Perhaps the most problematic aspect of rBGH milk for consumers who now turn to organic and raw milk, is that '...rBGH challenged the perception of milk as a quintessential “natural food”' (Smith-Howard 2014, Epilogue, 148). Many food movements today rely on the argument that natural food is better than processed food, which is why, rBGH milk is considered to be threatening, as organic milk and raw milk drinkers identify '... technologies, rather than disease organisms, as the greatest risk to milk purity' (Smith-Howard 2014, Epilogue, 148). One cannot overlook the irony of citing milk's natural qualities in the argument for raw milk, as the term *nature's perfect food* was not coined until pasteurization was widely adopted across the United States.

Nevertheless, there has been a surge in raw milk drinkers and activists in recent years, and with that surge, subsequently, the outbreaks of disease associated with raw milk also increased (The Washington Post Website 2014) which, in turn, led to the need for the government to take action. Thus we are seeing a number of raw milk activist websites popping up on the net and simultaneously, the US government is devoting parts of its websites to provide guidelines and information on the dangers of raw milk. There is also a legal aspect to the issue of unpasteurized milk, approximately (as of now), 15 states ban the sale of raw milk and 35 states allow the sale of raw milk to humans in some form (Digital Journal Website April 2014). However, the issue becomes even more complex when raw milk farmers sell or share their raw milk across state lines, the penalty for which is quite severe and has subsequently, caused the FDA grounds to intervene. The US government has conducted raids on raw milk farmers and sellers, where SWAT teams who are fully armed come and confiscate dairy products and ban farmers from producing any more unpasteurized dairy products. There are also legal penalties which they can face, as well as, possible jail time for those whom are caught selling or distributing raw milk across state lines (Farmageddon documentary 2011), (Forbes Magazine 2011), (The Washington Times 2011).

## 4. Theory and Analysis

### 4.1 The shift from power over death to power over life

In the History of Sexuality Volume 1 part 5 *Right of Death and Power over Life* Foucault discusses the concept of biopower and how in the eighteenth century there was a shift in power, from power over death to power over life (Foucault 1978, 138). This shifted interest from having the power to destroy life to preserving life or as Foucault has articulated so well '...the power to take life or let live was replaced by a power to foster life or disallow it to the point of death' (Foucault 1978, 138); with this power came new forms of governing which place the human body at a center of interest in power relations.

As Foucault explained '...this power over life evolved in two basic forms' (Foucault 1978, 139) one of which '...centered on the body as a machine: its disciplining, the optimization of its capabilities—its integration into systems of efficient and economic controls, all this was ensured by the procedures of power that characterized the disciplines: and anatomo-politics of the human body' (Foucault 1978, 139). Thus the human body was now at the center of politics, and the state developed interests in the well-being of the populations, with the intent to preserve life and avoid death at all costs, as in the mechanism of the power over life, Foucault asserts that death becomes the limit of power (Foucault 1978, 139). Furthermore, when power administered itself through the preservation of life, it made it harder for it to administer death, as how could a power which had the main role of preserving life, produce death? Subjects can only be governed as long as they are alive, thus it has become the prerogative to prolong and preserve life for as long as possible.

Foucault presents the second form of the power over life as being '...focused on the species of the body, the body imbued with the mechanics of life and serving as the basis of the biological processes: propagation, births and mortality, the level of health, life expectancy and longevity, with all the conditions that can cause these to vary' (Foucault 1978, 139). The health of the population was now a concern of the state, not the individual, when the state started to govern with an interest in maintaining life, then the health of its citizens became a primary concern. Subsequently, with the recognition of death being powers limit, leading to the role of government to foster life came new

forms of governing which Foucault maintains emerged in the form of “governmentality” which he conceptualizes as a power which targets the population as a whole, which abides to the form of knowledge that is political economy and relies on the apparatuses of security as its political technique (Foucault 2007, 144). Life was now to be 'managed' by the state (Foucault 1978, 139&149) and '...hence there was an explosion of numerous and diverse techniques for achieving the subjugation of bodies and the control of populations, marking the beginning of an era of “bio-power” (Foucault 1978, 140).

Foucauldian biopolitics disarticulates the order of politics, so that the previous interest to let live or let die, is transformed with the eighteenth century recognition of '...the fundamental biological fact that human beings are a species' (Foucault 2007, 1). This entailed that '...the basic biological features of the human species became the object of a political strategy—of a general strategy of power' (Foucault 2007, 1). This *political strategy* manifests itself in the form of biopower, a power which develops a whole reality based on the preservation of life, one which establishes norms, morals and shared values. Furthermore Foucault stresses '...another consequence of this development of bio-power was the growing importance assumed by the action of the norm, at the expense of the juridical system of the law' (Foucault 1978, 144). The norm became one of the most powerful forms of biopower, as norms act as the shared values of a population which establish what is right and what is wrong, which subsequently become embedded in society causing individuals to govern themselves in accordance with this set of norms which inform us essentially on how to live. Arguably, it can be easier for someone to break the law than to break a 'norm'. In order to position the example of the raw milk movement within the framework of this Foucauldian biopolitics, the emergence of the health of the population as an objective of the state needs to be traced back to the eighteenth century. This will be discussed in the next section.

#### 4.2 Foucault's account of the transformation of 'the body':

Foucault identifies how in the nineteenth century the body was transformed from previously being '...essentially the inscription surface for tortures and punishments' (Foucault 2001, 82) to becoming '...something to be molded, reformed, corrected, something that must require aptitudes, receive a certain number of qualities, become qualified as a body capable of working' (Foucault 2001, 82).

Thus the body which had always had a purpose when it came to exercising power was no longer the site for the exercising of force or punishment but instead was recognized as something of value, something which needed to be taken care of in order to maximize its utility.

The importance of the body as a site for exercising power emerges in Foucault's work in his discussion of what he deemed the creation of institutions of subjugation (Foucault 2001, 81). These institutions which ranged from penal, medical, pedagogical to industrial, which, according to Foucault, were ostensibly formed for protection and security, yet instead were 'institutions of subjugation' having three functions: over time, the body and creating new types of power (Foucault 2001, 79, 80, 82). The first function of the institutions of subjugation was establishing a mechanism which converted individual time to labor time (Foucault 2001, 81). This shift took place by restricting the amount of free time which was available after the work day. The importance of the first function of the institutions of subjugation, that is the regulation and control of individual time, is apparent in its relationship to the second function of subjugation: over the body, which in turn directly ties into the underlying theme of the construction of health which is being discussed in this investigation. For Foucault the main outcome of the first function of subjugation was that 'people's time had to be offered to the production apparatus; the production apparatus has to be able to use people's living time, their time of existence' (Foucault 2001, 80). Subsequently, when the time of the individual was being primarily converted into labor time, interest soon turned to the individual body as being capable of working.

The second function of institutions of subjugation then emerges as subjecting individual bodies to the mechanisms of control (Foucault 2001, 81), which seek to mold, reform, and correct bodies into becoming physically productive labor power. Thus the combination of the first and second functions of subjugation led to the entire existence of individuals' being under the control of these institutions (Foucault 2001, 82). Foucault pays particular attention to the ways in which bodies were now controlled, shaped, and valorized in order to gain qualities which molded them into becoming not only capable, but productive workers (Foucault 2001, 82). As a result the health of the body became an interest of the state.

Coinciding with the recognition of the power to let live, sickness and health were problematized in the eighteenth century with the development and growing initiatives of a manifold of social



institutions (Foucault 2001, 92). This problematization thus transformed the nature of health from being a problem of the individual to a concern of the state and with this transformation came '...the emergence of a multitude of sites in the social body of health and disease as problems requiring some form or other of collective control measures' (Foucault 2001, 92).

Although in the 19<sup>th</sup> century what Foucault deemed institutions of subjugation, were specialized into groups of for example, healing, production, teaching and punishment, as a whole they became to operationally produce a discipline of existence. The domain of health had shifted from being an individual's affair to a collective interest in the '...health and physical well-being of the population' (Foucault 2001, 94). The health of the population was now '...one of the essential objectives of political power' (Foucault 2001, 94), which was not concerned with a taxing marginal percentage of the population but instead, had an objective to raise the health of the population as a whole, thus a range of power apparatuses were given the responsibility of “bodies” to help, and in some cases restrain, and contain them, in order to guarantee the quality of their health (Foucault 2001, 94). In addition, when the matter of health moved from the individuals interest, to the collective interest, which then, in turn, was exercised on the individual level; institutions of subjugation produced a regulatory control on the health of individuals by for example, concentrating on hygiene, as well as, sexual behavior, demanding that school children washed their hands, and that factory workers did not participate in immoral sexual behavior (Foucault 2001, 81 & 82). Foucault characterizes this as 'the imperative of health—at once the duty of each and the objective of all' (Foucault 2001, 94) therefore, it was now the 'duty' of the individual to take care of their own health.

However, Foucault also discusses what emerged in the eighteenth century as '...the disposition of society as a milieu of physical well-being, health, and optimal longevity' (Foucault 2001, 94), the exercise of which, as he characterizes 'the exercise of these three latter functions—order, enrichment, and health is assured less through a single apparatus than by an ensemble of multiple regulations and institutions which in the eighteenth century take the generic name of “police”' (Foucault 2001, 94) Thus the multiple institutions of subjugation can be characterized as the “police”. Although the actions of these institutions become more apparent in the nineteenth century, what transpired in the eighteenth century was the emergence of health as matter of security, resulting in what Foucault coined *noso-politics*, with *noso* deriving from ancient Greek speculated as meaning disease. One of the prevalent issues was the matter of the sickness of the poor.

The new of noso-politics then problematized what the sickness of the poor would mean for the health of the population as a whole, and moved from tackling the issue of poor with charity to imposing a form of medical police (Foucault 2001, 95). As a result, the eighteenth century sees the population become an '...object of surveillance, analysis, intervention, modifications and so on' (Foucault 2001, 95). This in turn, fosters the interest in the longevity, productivity and health of the population as a 'technology of the population' takes shape, where the health of the population begins to be measured in various ways: life expectancy, mortality levels, birth rate, and marriage and procreation (Foucault 2001, 95). These statistics, in turn, provide information on the population which lead to the development of new variables ranging from distinguishing the rich and the poor, the sick and the healthy, to the development of variables which directly explore the population in terms of productive utility, that is those whom will be a profitable investment, whom it would be worthwhile to train, as well as, those whom had a greater chance of surviving death and illness (Foucault, 2001, 95&96). The population was now subjected to numerous calculations which sought to, above all, increase its economic utility which subsequently led to the factorizing of biological traits of the population in relation to managing the economy (Foucault 2001, 96). Thus an apparatus emerged around the biological traits of the population which secured their subjugation and maximized their productive value (Foucault 2001, 96).

As the biological traits of the population emerged as the site for achieving the greatest utility of the population in the scheme of its integration into the apparatuses of production, children were problematized in the eighteenth century, in numerous ways, for they were now valued more as the future work force. Thus their preservation became key to future economic prosperity. Foucault identifies how the 'problem of children', being their birth and mortality rate in relation to the population as a whole, becomes bound to the problem of "childhood", which is surviving to adulthood. This survival now depends on a number of factors ranging from economic to physical conditions coupled with an investment in the child's development years which are paramount for the future outcome in regard to the future utility of the child in adulthood (Foucault 2001, 96). Subsequently, producing the optimal amount of children was no longer the objective, as it had been previously in relation to gaining enough military power, instead importance was placed on how this imperative phase of an infant's life was managed (Foucault 2001, 95). In a sense parenting becomes synonymous with the management of children.

The medicalization of the family saw a shift from a system of kinship to having the role of achieving continuously safe and nurturing physical conditions which serve to ensure the development and maintenance of the body of the child. Henceforth, the family structures itself around fostering the development of the child, creating conditions which ensure the child's survival to adulthood, this is achieved by the restriction of the components which make up the family (Foucault 2001, 97). The eighteenth century therefore, saw a multiplicity of responsibilities placed on the family such as ensuring physical and aerial hygiene by systematically washing not only the bodies but also of clothes and living spaces, in addition, living spaces needed to be aired enough to ensure that all of the family members received enough clean air, as well as, a measure of preventing disease. The physical space of living spaces was also shaped in order to maintain the optimal health of the family with attention to room and furniture layouts. Finally, the physical health of the family was also ensured through the emphasis of the importance of exercise (Foucault 2001, 96 & 97). There has obviously been few changes to this system as families are still required to ensure the hygiene and cleanliness of not only the bodies of children but of their clothes and living spaces, and foodstuffs, we are now however, much more regulated in the way the family *must* live, as we have strict guidelines as to *how* to live as a family and institutions which can intervene if these instructions are not met.

If health was problematized in the eighteenth century, as well as, the conceptions of childhood and adulthood, then the family in the nineteenth century served to develop the biopolitics of health in a more precise and distinguished way. As was discussed earlier, Foucault focused a great deal on the 'institutions of subjugation' which perhaps originally emerged in the eighteenth century in the form of the 'police', but were specialized in the nineteenth century for the different tasks at hand needed for ensuring the health of the population, as Foucault has often characterized the nineteenth century as the point when '...the biological came under state control' (Foucault 2003, 239 & 240) and a '...”biopolitics” of the human race' (Foucault 2003, 243) emerged.

Perhaps the most prevailing issue of the nineteenth century when it came to the biopolitics of health was two-fold, that of the epidemic and that of the endemic. As it was already established in the eighteenth century that death was powers limit, the epidemic, which had troubled political powers for centuries as it caused numerous deaths on a massive scale among peoples, was problematized (Foucault 2003, 243). However, with the improvements in the area of medicine, the epidemic was something which the state could in most cases begin to tackle. Instead it was the endemic which posed

the largest threat to the health of the population.

Unlike the epidemic, the endemic which could be described as '...the form, nature, extension, duration, and intensity of the illnesses prevalent in a population' (Foucault 2003, 243), did not produce imminent death, instead it acted in a way which systematically weakened the work force, gnawing at the productive utility of the individual which subsequently led to falls in production and costly treatments (Foucault 2003, 243 & 244). Furthermore, it was the children—aka the future workforce who were often most at risk of falling prey to the endemic. In order to tackle the problem posed by the endemic, the function of medicine was transformed from merely healing, to having the function of ensuring and normalizing knowledge of public hygiene and health, this was achieved through various institutions and campaigns which educated the public on 'proper' health and hygiene (Foucault 2003, 244). This resulted in a normalized conception of health and hygiene which would shape the actions and way we conceive what is healthy behavior, and what is not.

#### 4.3 The emergence of two realities

If we consider the raw milk debate then the elements which have just been discussed in the previous chapter are profoundly manifested in its history, as what led to the politicization of raw milk to begin with, was in fact, the endemic. Although Louis Pasteur's invention of pasteurization was what distinguished raw milk and pasteurized milk from one another, the root of the problem of raw milk was due to tainted milk which then acted as a site for spreading multiple diseases, resulting in endemics of tuberculosis, scarlet fever, diphtheria to name a few. To make matters worse, it was the children of populations who were mostly affected from tainted milk, and infant mortality soared as a result of drinking tainted raw milk. The tainted raw milk was arguably directly a result of urbanization, as it was not until the birth of the dairy in the mid-nineteenth century that tainted and diseased milk began to emerge on a scale which could affect the whole population. Those whom were at risk when drinking tainted raw milk were primarily children and pregnant women, as tainted raw milk was not only the cause of the spread of multiple diseases such as tuberculosis and namely scarlet fever which affected children the most, it also caused Listeriosis in many mothers leading to miscarriage or stillbirth. Thus tainted raw milk was systematically not only weakening, but also endangering, the future workforce as it was infants and unborn children who were the victims.

Subsequently, the late nineteenth and early twentieth century saw the securitization of raw milk and the government began to issue guidelines and health ordinances in the early twentieth century which advised the American people not to drink unpasteurized milk. Over a century later pasteurized milk has become the norm and raw milk the exception. However, as the raw milk debate is still ongoing the government has taken measures to ensure that history does not repeat itself, as the high infant mortalities as a result of tainted raw milk of the nineteenth and early twentieth century continue to haunt the United States.

The two main institutions which currently ensure public health in the United States are the Federal Drug Administration (FDA) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). The FDA on its website, states that it is *responsible* for 'protecting the public health' (FDA1) through various measures. These measures range from tobacco, medical and cosmetic regulation to more importantly foodstuffs. The FDA asserts that they are 'protecting' the public health by 'assuring foods—are safe, wholesome, sanitary and properly labeled' (FDA1). Therefore, it is the FDA's *responsibility* to make sure that foodstuffs (those which are under their jurisdiction excluding poultry, meat and eggs which are regulated by the United States Department of Agriculture), are 'safe', connoting without risk, 'sanitary' connoting good hygiene, and 'wholesome' connoting good healthy food. Furthermore, it is also their responsibility to make sure that foodstuffs are 'properly' labelled. The result of this process of ensuring foodstuffs are safe, sanitary, and wholesome is that it is on this high up level that the decision of what is 'safe' and what is not, for consumers to consume is made.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in turn, conceptualizes its role in the slogan which states (the CDC) 'Saving lives, Protecting People'. Whereas, The FDA has the role of the regulator, the CDC has the role of the 'protector'. On the CDC website the language which is used to describe the 'mission' of the CDC constructs a heroic institution which 'protect (s) America from health, safety and security threats' (CDC1), in addition, the CDC 'fights disease and supports communities and citizens to do the same' (CDC1). Even the word mission carries military connotations which adds to the underlying theme that the CDC is basically fighting a 'war' against disease and health threats in its efforts to 'protect' the health of the American people. However, the CDC is not *fighting* alone but is also supporting citizens and communities to do the same. This is done by (providing) 'health information that protects our nation against expensive and dangerous health threats' (CDC1) and 'Promoting healthy and safe behaviors, communities and environment' (CDC1).

The biopolitical aspects of the roles of these institutions are rather explicit. As in the case of the CDC 'promoting' healthy and safe behaviors, not *enforcing* them. The FDA in turn, 'protects' the health of the American people by *regulating* out the bad before it can reach the people. Similarly to the CDC, the FDA also has a slogan 'Protecting and Promoting *your* Health'. Thus once again the language is very soft conveying that the FDA is *protecting* and *promoting* the health of the American people, rather than *enforcing* 'good' health. Both the FDA and CDC issue guidelines and offer information regarding foodstuffs, medicines, as well as, healthy and safe behaviors. The FDA and the CDC are actively involved in the raw milk debate. Both have dedicated sections of their websites to publicize the dangers of raw milk and warn consumers that it is not safe to drink, including cautionary tales of consumers who drank raw milk and then suffered severe consequences. In a way you could say they are *fighting* a war against raw milk.

The FDA has dedicated a section of its website to raw milk titled: 'The Dangers of Raw Milk: Unpasteurized Milk Can Pose a Serious Health Risk'. This section includes information about raw milk and pasteurization, as well as, a short film which is titled 'The Dangers of Unpasteurized Milk'. In the opening remarks of this short film the narrator asserts that 'it is important to buy only those products made with pasteurized milk' (FDA2) shortly after she explains that 'unpasteurized or raw milk from cows, sheep, goats or other animals can carry bacteria that can make you sick, like salmonella, E.coli, campylobacter, and listeria' (FDA2). Notice how she doesn't say 'don't drink raw milk', as 'don't' is not really in the vocabulary when it comes to governmental guidelines. Instead she says that it is 'important' only to buy products made with pasteurized milk, this acting as an affirmative way to saying no, no to drinking raw milk that is.

Furthermore, the language that is used at the beginning of the film is relatively light and informative, explaining quite simply that consumers can get sick from drinking raw milk which is why it is important to only drink pasteurized milk. However, the light nature of this educational film quickly shifts to basically stating that *you could die if you drink raw milk*. The words 'die' and 'death' subsequently appear twice in the 2 minutes and 56 seconds which comprise this film. The film moves on from its light start to state that by drinking raw milk consumers are at risk of getting diarrhea, stomach cramping and vomiting, but also, kidney disease, liver disease, paralysis, chronic disorders and ultimately death. In addition, risk groups are singled out including the elderly and those with weakened immune systems, but namely children and pregnant women. The narrator cautions pregnant

women: 'if your pregnant drinking raw milk or eating foods made from raw milk such as soft cheeses, can lead to miscarriage or stillbirth' (FDA2), however, the narrator also asserts that 'it's important to remember that healthy people of any age can get very sick, or even die if they drink contaminated raw milk.' (FDA2).

The main message of this film is conveyed primarily through fear, with the bottom line being that if you drink raw milk, or even worse if you give your family raw milk, you or one of them could die. This is not to argue that the information which the FDA is providing consumers is not factual, as there is the history from the nineteenth and twentieth century which supports the claims that contaminated raw milk can cause these diseases. However, this is also based on a rather limited number of individuals who have gotten ill from drinking raw milk. In the video the narrator states: "Why pasteurized? Because hundreds of people have gotten sick after drinking raw milk for the past decade" (FDA2). If you think of the American population as a whole then the percentage of 'hundreds of people' in the last decade getting sick from raw milk, and the amount of deaths from raw milk, probably do not constitute very many in relation to the entire American population. Yet the language which is used in this educational film turns drinking raw milk into an eminent threat. It is common sense really that if the American population is currently estimated to be around 317 million (US News 2013) then in the scheme of things hundreds of people over the period of ten years getting sick from raw milk, with probably a very marginal amount actually dying from raw milk, then arguably it does not really constitute an eminent health threat. However, that is not to say that contaminated raw milk can pose great risks to health as it is known that diseases such as tuberculosis and listeria thrive in raw milk, yet it should be noted that the amount of these cases does not really constitute a national health threat.

If you consider this in relation with cancer and heart disease, with heart disease being the number one killer causing 600 000 deaths a year in the United States (CDC Website 2014) and cancer coming in second with 574,743 deaths a year (CDC Website 2013), then the possibility that drinking raw milk could cause death seems rather overstated in the anti-raw milk rhetoric which the FDA is preaching in the educational film, as well as, on the website in general. If we play with this statistical issue a little bit further then we can take the amount of deaths in the United States caused by suicide each year, which are 38,364 (CDC Website 2013) and compare that to the hundreds of people who get sick over the period of ten years, then in this scenario there is almost a greater risk to commit suicide than

die from drinking raw milk. This is of course being an exaggerated example—an inappropriate one at that. Of course, when looking at these statistics it is also important to keep in mind that raw milk is a very regulated substance, so the amount of deaths caused by raw milk are directly correlated to the fact that it is not necessarily readily available—or has not been since the beginning of the twentieth century.

Nevertheless, the way in which the FDA articulates the threat of death, from drinking raw milk is arguably overstated and exaggerated. This is again, not to say that it can't cause death, however, it is a very marginal amount. Simply stating that raw milk can carry various diseases would have sufficed in constructing it into a health threat. Instead, the FDA is using fear to guide consumers into the right direction, which is away from raw milk. The obvious question here would be to ask why? However, the scope of this investigation cannot allow that as it might require a whole separate investigation of its own to find an extensive answer. Arguably, instead of asking the obvious question of *why* they are taking such measures to demonize raw milk, in the quest of revealing whether they may or may not be a bigger force behind this act of securitizing raw milk. A more intriguing approach, is to think of *why*, in biopolitical terms, why the government has an interest in the health the public, and moreover, an interest in protecting and promoting public health. This in turn, leads to the second question which is *how* they do this. Therefore, I think the obvious question should be left on the back burner and instead, this investigation aims to ask the less obvious questions in the framework of biopolitics.

The educational film *The Dangers of Unpasteurized Milk* concludes by providing guidelines and instructions as to how to 'avoid raw milk and milk products' (FDA2) which include being vigilant when reading the labels of dairy products, making sure they include the word 'pasteurized', furthermore, consumers are encouraged to be especially vigilant when buying milk or other dairy products from local or farmers markets. The film ends on the note that 'keeping this information in mind will help keep you and your family safe from harmful bacteria that can be found in unpasteurized milk and milk products' (FDA2). The emphasis is thus placed on the health of the family, and especially children and mothers. Families' therefore, can keep themselves safe by living by these guidelines. The raw milk activists are not ignored by the FDA, they are an intrinsic part of constructing the threat that is raw milk. They are referred to as 'some people' who 'believe that drinking raw milk is more nutritious and more easily digested, or they believe that pasteurized milk creates problems like lactose intolerance' (FDA2). The film proceeds to explaining the health risks of



raw milk and thus proving 'some people' wrong.

On the CDC website there are testimonials about the health risks of raw milk. These three testimonials are the tales of three mothers who either chose to drink raw milk themselves, or chose to give raw milk to their families. The testimonials are titled 'Real stories of the dangers of raw milk'. In the cases of Mary McGonigle-Martin and Julie Riggs, both mothers chose to give their family raw milk, as a result either their children got sick or both their husbands and children got sick. Kalee Prue on the other hand, drank raw milk herself and got very sick. The story in each testimonial starts in similar ways, the mothers had read about the health benefits of raw milk, and either had some type of health problem themselves, or their children had a health problem, or were simply interested in offering their children healthier foods, so they decided to try raw milk. Specific details of the mothers are included to construct what you might deem 'all American women', as Mary is the 'kind of mom who does her homework' (CDC3), and Julie 'had always been a very cautious mother' (CDC3), whereas, Kalee was a 'health-conscious, single mom from Connecticut, who enjoyed being active' (CDC3), yet they all became 'victims' of raw milk.

Essentially, all of the mothers, in their separate testimonials, had decided to drink raw milk, after which in the case of Mary, who had given raw milk to her 7-year old son, her son got very sick. Kalee had drank raw milk herself and soon found herself to be very ill. Julie gave raw milk to her husband and daughter which resulted in them both getting seriously ill. In all of the cases the culprit was an E.coli infection as a result of drinking raw milk, this in turn led to serious health consequences.

Both Mary and Julie express in their testimonials how they thought their children were either going to suffer from serious illnesses for the rest of their lives or going to die. The narrator explains how Mary 'went from being the mother of a child with diarrhea and vomiting, to the mother of a child who was in kidney failure and needed dialysis' (CDC3), Mary then expressed that she 'truly thought he was going to die' (CDC3). Julia in turn, explains how her daughters 'pancreas shut down. Her kidneys weren't functioning so she had to have that dialysis constantly' (CDC3). Furthermore, Julie feared that her daughter might 'have a seizure or stroke' (CDC3). This ordeal was coupled with Julie's husband getting sick, leaving her alone and as the narrator puts it 'Julie was forced to make the medical decisions on her own' (CDC3), and as Julie explained 'I didn't know if I was going to be able to make all the right decisions without him being there' (CDC3). Kalee suffered a different ordeal than Mary

and Julie because in her case she became ill from drinking raw milk, not her child. The narrator explains how 'she expected raw milk to improve her health' (CDC3) and the consequence of drinking raw milk which was that 'she was too weak to care for her 18 month old son' (CDC3). Kalee explains: 'my kidneys were shutting down and were almost completely non-functional at that point' (CDC3). The narrator then concludes that 'Kalee drank raw milk because she thought it was a healthy choice, but after her health battles, she knows better' (CDC3).

All of the mothers then renounce raw milk and explain how they felt they were 'cheated' into believing that raw milk was safe to drink. Mary explains how she felt she was 'lulled into a false sense of safety' (CDC3) by a raw milk farmer, Kalee in turn now stresses that 'you have to make good choices and you need to think about the consequences' (CDC3), and Julie has the most to say stating that 'If I had any idea that there was even a slight risk that something like this could happen I would never ever had taken that chance' the narrator comments on how Julie realized just 'how uninformed she was about the risks of raw milk' (CDC3), Julie continues with the thought that she 'easily could have lost either one of them really' (CDC3). Julie's testimonial concludes with her warning that 'the risk in raw milk is not worth any kind of benefit you could ever get from it. You could lose your life, but even if you don't you could be sick for the rest of your life. You could have to have a kidney transplant. You could have strokes, seizures; it's just not worth it' (CDC3).

In these testimonials, taken from the section of the CDC website which focus on the dangers of raw milk, not only is raw milk constructed as a major life threatening health threat, but the raw milk producers are also demonized into cheating innocent 'healthy' and 'cautious' mothers into drinking raw milk. These 'victims' of raw milk found their children at deaths door as a result of giving them raw milk, and in the case of the single mother who was unable to take care of her child because she drank raw milk, drinking raw milk essentially threatened to orphan her child.

If we consider the role of the FDA and CDC which is to 'promote' health and healthy behavior, then the nature of these testimonials serves to illustrate what happens to those whom did not follow FDA and CDC guidelines, when it came to drinking raw milk. The purpose of these testimonials arguably act as a warning and produce fear among the American public, through the constant association of death with drinking raw milk. They are securitizing raw milk to the extent that the American public understand that if you drink raw milk you have the risk of getting seriously ill or even dying. Drinking

raw milk does not fall into the category of 'safe behavior' which the CDC promotes, instead it is unsafe behavior, which the CDC in turn is putting its efforts towards revealing.

Instead of trying to read too much into the reasons why the FDA and CDC are so aggressively securitizing raw milk, arguably, if we consider the history of the raw milk debate then it is understandable that the government would not like to return to the period of the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century when raw milk was not only responsible for multiple illnesses in the American population, but was also responsible for very high infant mortality and miscarriages. These are sufficient grounds to constitute raw milk as a health threat, at least, the government conceives it as a health threat, so therefore, it will be apparent in their regulations and guidelines. The issue which is more interesting is *how* they articulate these guidelines and *why*.

Let us think now about the role of the mother and children, not only in the FDA and CDC material, but also how it was articulated by Foucault. Emotive aspects of the children dying are surpassed in the work of Foucault, as instead children, like adults are thought of in terms of their productive utility. Of course there is an emotive aspect, however, the extent to which the government has interest in the bodies of the population lie primarily in their utility in the apparatuses of production.

Although in the CDC testimonials the mothers are not constructed to be particularly bad parents, there is an underlying theme that they endangered their families by giving them raw milk. It is important to notice that the fathers were not interviewed, instead, the mother and child were the object of attention. If we consider the case of the single mother, not only was she endangering her own life by drinking raw milk, she was taking the risk that her child might become an orphan. If it is the sole responsibility of the family to ensure the transition from childhood to adulthood, by primarily ensuring the development of the child to becoming a productive adult, then the single mother in the CDC testimonial was on the verge of completely failing this task. Because she was too sick to take care of her child, her child was in danger of not becoming a productive adult. As the narrator emphasized and stressed 'she was *unable to take care* of her son' because she drank raw milk. This illustrates why it is important that adults not only ensure the health of their children, but also their own.

It becomes obvious that in the eyes of the CDC this is essentially the worst thing that can happen to

a parent, their inability to take care of their child—the inability to ensure the development of their child to a productive adult. This in turn, is the fear of virtually every parent—that if they were in a situation where they could no longer care for their children, then there is the possibility that someone would then take their children away, such as the social services. Arguably, the social services also act as means of producing fear in parents, this fear regulates their behavior into ensuring the well-being of their children, similarly, they must ensure their own well-being so that they can care for their children. Thus it is no longer left to simple emotive motivations such as love, there is also this underlying fear that if you do not take proper care of your children then the government can take them away in order to 'ensure' their well-being.

Perhaps one of the most interesting aspects of the raw milk debate is indeed that both parties base their arguments on health. In Foucault's work the emergence of the health of the population as an objective of the state, as well as, an apparatus of biopower taking shape around the promotion of healthy behaviors, is well detailed in his work. In a sense, it is because of this interest in the health of the population that we live the way we do—striving to be healthy—or more so, avoiding things which endanger our health. One cannot overlook the irony that it is essentially the state which has molded us into being health conscious beings interested in promoting our health and avoiding things dangerous to our health, yet the raw milk movement is constructing its entire argument for drinking raw milk on the belief that it is promoting their health. If you consider the history of the raw milk debate which was discussed earlier, then this type of movement really never should have happened. At the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century raw milk, which generally was referred to as just milk, was essentially a killer. Before it became *nature's perfect food* it was mainly associated with causing infant mortality on a massive level. Milk was a serious problem, which is why, as a result of government efforts, by 1940 pasteurized milk had become the norm. Today, what raw milk is, is no longer common knowledge, what used to just be 'milk' is now something estranged to people, especially living in urban environments. In light of this, the raw milk movement really is an odd occurrence.

In 1980 Richard Crawford published *Healthism and the medicalization of everyday life* in which he argued that as a result of the new consciousness of health and the rise of health movements the problem of health is continually construed as a problem of the individual. Nikolas Rose in his book *Powers of Freedom: reframing political thought* draws from Foucault's notions of governmentality

and in a way extends it by asserting his own 'ethico-politics' which he argues '...concerns itself with the self-techniques necessary for responsible self-government and the relations between one's obligation to oneself and one's obligations to others' (Rose 1999, 188). Rose identifies Healthism as one of these 'self-techniques' thus illustrated 'in the new modes of regulating health, individuals are addressed on the assumption that they want to be healthy, and enjoined to freely seek out the ways of living most likely to promote their own health' (Rose 1999, 86 & 87). Furthermore, Healthism brings together 'public objectives for the good health and good order of the social body with the desire of individuals' for personal health and well-being' (Rose 1999, 94). This ties in with Rose's ethico-politics as an extension of Foucault's governmentality in that the private "ethics" which construct health are in turn, contributing to public "ethics" of maintaining public hygiene.

Subsequently, Foucault's recognition of the health of the population arising in the eighteenth century as an objective of the state and thus a collective objective of all, which was then in turn, enforced by various techniques of medicalization and the subjugation of bodies, is further explored in Rose's work by exploring the current self-techniques which arise in Healthism. The recognition that regulating health now lies on the assumption that individuals are interested in promoting their health, and *want* to be healthy, thus they live in a way that promotes their own health, positions the biopolitics of health into our current reality. More than ever before, it seems, there is an interest in health, and more importantly, its promotion. Furthermore, this interest arises from the individual level. Arguably, some of this interest should be attributed to the rising scientific field of nutrition for instance, yet Foucault's argument concerning the medicalization of the population in the eighteenth century should not be forgotten.

In recent years there has been a surge in food movements with activists seeking better health and well-being through nutrition, as well as, more awareness on the conditions their food was produced in coupled, with where their food comes from. There is for example the organic movement which seek to have food which is free of pesticides or antibiotics, the local food movement which pays particular attention to where their food comes from, citing environmental issues, as well as, personal well-being as their reasons for only eating local. Then there are those who belong to both these movements. A general interest in food, nutrition, and health have sparked this type of activism in recent years. Many food activists claim that they are worried about chemicals in their food which cause health problems such as cancer, others are animal rights advocates and cannot tolerate the poor

conditions in which animals are being farmed on the mass industrial level. Another reason for food activism is that people want to get back to the natural way food used to be produced.

Food movements seen as a manifestation of Healthism have subsequently been under fire, presented in current discourses in the field of biopolitics. In particular, the idea of Healthism as a biopolitical technique has been employed by many. See for example, Lebasco, Kathleen (2011) *Neoliberalism, Public Health and the Moral Perils of Fatness*; Rich, Emma (2011) *'I see her being obese!': Public Pedagogy, Reality Media and the Obesity Crisis*; and Rysst, Mari (2010) *"Healthism" and Looking Good: Body Ideals and Body Practices in Norway*. Arguably, the raw milk movement also falls into this category of manifesting Healthism among raw milk activists. However, the nature of the movement is very interesting because if Healthism as argued by Rose brings together 'public objectives for the good health and good order of the social body with the desire of individuals for personal health and well-being' (Rose 1999, 94), then the Healthism which is evident in the raw milk movement does nothing of the sort, as the views of raw milk activist are fundamentally conflicting with the views of the US government on health, as well as, norms concerning health which are prevailing in society. Subsequently, an argument can be made concerning the political techniques which emerged in the eighteenth century of enforcing public health through regulatory apparatuses of security, medicalization of the family and normalizing health with the underlying theme of an interest in preserving human capital recognized as the labor force. This normalization of the promotion of health has been reproduced to the point where in the twenty-first century Healthism emerges entailing that individuals seek to promote their own health, which in turn, contributes to protecting the health of the population as a whole.

However, a window of opportunity arises in the raw milk movement which makes room for the argument that things have drastically changed. In producing individuals who live in a way that optimally promotes their health and subsequently, their longevity—simultaneously, an arguably unforeseen force emerges presenting competing notions of health. This manifests in the justifications of promoting health which raw milk activists provide concerning their consumption of raw milk, which are fundamentally conflicting with those provided in US health guidelines which strictly deem raw milk a safety hazard.

The main justification which raw milk activists provide for drinking raw milk is above all that they

believe that raw milk is “better” for their health. There are some who proclaim raw milk as a cure to all their previous health problems, and others who state an overall improvement in their family’s health after drinking raw milk, by for example stating that they have not had the common cold since drinking raw milk. This is due to the prevalent belief among raw milk activists that pasteurization kills healthy bacteria which can be found in raw milk. The Weston A. Price Foundation is cited by many raw milk activists in both their testimonials, and also is present in the raw milk activist film *Farmageddon*. The foundation, according to their website 'is a nonprofit, tax-exempt nutrition education foundation' (Weston A. Price Foundation Website) which subsequently advocates drinking raw milk and the rights of raw milk activists. In the *Farmageddon* documentary the President of the Weston A. Price Foundation Sally Fallon Morell explains why raw milk is 'inherently safe': “You can get sick from any food but raw milk is inherently safe. There are dozens of components in raw milk that kill pathogens and at the same time, strengthen your own immune system” (F1). This argument that raw milk is inherently safe because of the 'components' referring to 'good' bacteria, kill pathogens and strengthen the immune systems is the common view of all raw milk activists which is why they, in a sense, demonize pasteurization as destroying these very components, which make raw milk 'inherently safe'.

In a testimonial on the Real Milk Website, Mary Seguin from Des Plaines, Illinois explains in a testimonial titled 'Family’s Health Improved Once We Disregarded FDA/Media Advice' (RM1) how “Pasteurization destroys valuable enzymes, diminishes vitamin content, denatures fragile milk proteins, virtually destroys B6 and B12 and kills beneficial bacteria. Pasteurization is associated with allergies, tooth decay, colic in infants, growth problems, ear infections in children, osteoporosis, arthritis” (RM1). Laura Gallagher from Arlington Heights, Illinois in a testimony titled 'Family Farms Co-op helps people be healthy!' continues to discredit pasteurization, and refers to the current American dairy market as a “de-natured milk supply”. In her testimonial she asks “is everyone aware of how much Vitamin C is killed during the pasteurization of milk? I’ve read that it’s equivalent to the whole citrus crop in the U.S. Isn’t that remarkable? I didn’t even know that milk contains Vitamin C” (RM1). After which she asserts “raw milk still does. Raw milk also has enzymes that help it be easily digestible—that too is destroyed through pasteurization” (RM1). Finally in the *Farmageddon* documentary the view that raw milk is inherently safe and contains important 'healing' components which pasteurization subsequently, kills, is backed up with the authority of a doctor, as Dr. Donald Fields a Pediatrician concludes that “raw milk does prevent illnesses, in particular it prevents asthma

exacerbations, eczema exacerbations, allergic rhinitis exacerbations and it does so by stabilizing that mass cell of allergy cell and preventing it from releasing the histamine” (F1).

Essentially, raw milk activists are securitizing pasteurization into being the culprit of many health problems, and instead asserting that raw milk firstly does not cause these types of health problems, and secondly, has the ability to heal them. In a sense in these testimonials raw milk activist's Mary and Laura are reaffirming the view of good health which has been provided by the US government in dietary guidelines on health, which subsequently, include daily recommendations of how many vitamins each individual needs in order to maintain their health. They are conforming to the normative view of what is healthy by paying such attention to getting enough *important* vitamins in their diet, such as Vitamin C and Vitamins B6 and B12. However, by doing this they are essentially using one normative view on health to break another norm of 'healthy' behavior, by asserting that raw milk contains these healthy vitamins, and that pasteurization destroys them, which in turn demonizes pasteurization into being bad for their health. They are using the norm of healthy nutritional guidelines ascribed by the US government to then in turn, discredit another norm ascribed by US government of healthy behavior which entails only drinking pasteurized milk. This illustrates how the raw milk movement contains aspects of Healthism yet has somehow managed to articulate this into a tool of resisting biopower.

The claim presented by Dr. Donald Fields that raw milk prevents illness is echoed in other raw milk activists' claims that raw milk has essentially cured them. In a testimonial from the website *Rejoice in Life*, Shawn Dady, a homemaker from Brentwood USA, in her testimonial titled 'Bladder infections, eczema, early onset of arthritis. First 2 problems since teens, arthritis for 6 years' explains how she suffered from bladder infections, eczema, and arthritis, for which she had mainly medicated with antibiotics and steroid creams, however, after the problems did not go away she tried raw milk. She rejoices how “Raw milk, raw cream, raw butter and raw milk kefir and yogurt cleared up all three problems completely. The results are permanent” (RIL1) and subsequently asserts that “Raw dairy is a super health food and should never be kept back from the public access” (RIL1). This feeds into the characterization of raw milk being a 'miracle' cure to multiple health problems. However, it only works if it is consumed consistently as another raw milk activist Tracey Rollinson from Indianapolis in her testimonial on the Rejoice in Life Website, makes clear as she states “I don't believe the results are permanent, based on past experience. I know that as the cells in my body nourished on raw milk



die, my symptoms will gradually return, as they did in the past. So I must have raw milk. It now dictates where we can live” (RIL1). Tracey's testimonial illustrates how drinking raw milk really becomes a lifestyle, with an entire value system constructed around drinking raw milk. The fact that Tracey strongly declares that raw milk now dictates where she (and her family) can live, affirms how strong this movement is becoming. It is a movement in which the lives of raw milk activists begin to revolve around drinking raw milk, which entails that they live in a place where they can obtain raw milk, and that they assert their rights to be able to drink raw milk which, for many, are justified outside of the law.

In a testimonial on the Real Milk Website titled 'Thank you for keeping real food available' a mother proclaims that 'As any parent knows, when one's child's welfare is at stake, laws are secondary. I consider myself a law-abiding citizen...But I would beg, borrow, or steal raw milk for Julia if I had to. I would drive to the side of a country road at midnight to obtain the milk she needs—if I had to.' (RM1) She also asserts that she is “a dues-paying member of the cow-sharing program” (RM1), a cow-share being a process where either a group of people buy a milking cow together and share the milk, or an individual buys a milking cow through a cow-share and pays the operators to milk their cow for a fee. The cow-share will be discussed in depth later. Instead, what emerges in this mother's testimonial is the theme of the health of the children and health of the family which manifests in the rhetoric of raw milk activists.

Foucault discussed what manifested in the eighteenth century as the medicalization of the family, under which the role of the family shifted from traditional kinship system to having the role of creating a safe and nurturing environment which served to ensure the development of the child's body. Henceforth, the family was structured around fostering the health and development of the child, ensuring the child's survival to adulthood. This was achieved by, beginning in the eighteenth century, ascribing multiple responsibilities on the family, ranging from ensuring hygiene to washing clothes and living spaces and embarking on physical exercise, in order to achieve optimal health. These measures were a result of the recognition of the productive utility of the body by the state, thus ensuring this labor utility became an objective of the state. Subsequently, the role of the family of ensuring the lives of the future labor force became perhaps the most important role of all.

In light of this, it is interesting how raw milk activists primarily justify drinking raw milk on the basis

of the health of their family. They express their main objective to be ensuring the health of their family, which they in turn, believe is by collectively drinking raw milk. Subsequently, they often single out the health benefits which their children have felt since drinking raw milk, some even explain how their babies thrived only after they started drinking milk when it was raw.

Mary, the mother who wrote the testimonial titled 'Family's Health Improved Once We Disregarded FDA/Media Advice' (RM1) attributes her children's good health to drinking raw milk. Mary explains how she initially became interested in drinking raw milk: "I became interested in the ill effects of pasteurization when my infants had difficulty digesting milk based formula's and again when my older son developed skin rashes that the Dr. told me was a result of a milk allergy" (RM1). Her children who had been raised on what Mary calls "hormone laden, pasteurized milk" had health problems including "recurrent ear infection, milk allergies, skin rashes and colic" (RM1). Mary asserts that "Since we have disregarded much of the FDA and media instructions as to what is healthy for our families, our family's health has improved tremendously" (RM1). Subsequently, she accounts how her youngest child has thrived on raw milk: "My 18 month old who has been raised completely on raw milk has been the most healthy and contented baby I have had" (RM1) which in turn has affirmed her feelings of being a good mother, as she concludes "It is a wonderful feeling to know, that as a mother, I am providing the best food for my family in raw milk" (RM1).

What is evident in Mary's testimonial is that she directly sees a correlation between discrediting FDA advice and the improvement of her families health asserting that once she 'discredited' pasteurization, her children's health problems all virtually disappeared. Furthermore, her 18 month old child is 'the most healthy' baby she has had, simply because she has only provided raw milk for her baby to consume. In Mary's concluding remark, regarding how she feels it is a wonderful feeling to know that she is providing the best food for her family in raw milk, there is an underlying connotation that by providing raw milk for her family, she is a good mother.

Similarly a mother, Laura Turner, in a testimonial on the Rejoice in Life Website accounts for raw milk curing her baby of colic. She explains in her testimonial that she "Had heard about the homemade baby formula in the nourishing traditions book by Sally Fallon. It requires raw milk that is from grass fed cow. Colic was gone within days and baby is so happy" (RIL1) concluding that "Now my niece is starting the formula. It is hard to find a dairy source due to the laws. Hope to get the laws changed"

(RIL1) .Another mother, Cortney, explains in a testimonial on the Real Milk Website that she also gave her baby raw milk, Cortney accounts: “I am a mom of three children and one on the way. I was skeptical on raw milk at one point. My son who was born with a lot of health issues needed something to help “boost” him up” (RM1) after her nutritionist advised her to try raw milk, according to Cortney's own words “hesitatingly” they did. Cortney explains the outcome: “Holy Cow. (pardon the expression). He gained over 2 lbs. in a month, had no colds during that month, and seemed to be feeling better. It seemed to “heal” his gut...and he just started doing better over all” (RM1). As a result, Cortney now asserts that “I will advocate for Raw Milk in any way I can. I only buy Raw Milk. And refuse to buy “store bought” milk. It also goes along with my belief of “support your local farmers” (RM1). She concludes that “Raw Milk has done so much for my family...and I could not be happier. Are there any bumper stickers out there? Or t-shirts of some kind? I want to spread the word any way I can” (RM1).

A belief system surrounding raw milk emerges in these testimonials which equates drinking raw milk to better health for individuals and families, as well as, overall happiness. Another issue which arises in the testimonials of Laura and Cortney is that they both are spreading this rhetoric to others. As a result of feeding her baby formula made from raw milk, Laura's niece is also drinking a formula made from raw milk. Cortney, in turn, asserts that she will promote and advocate drinking raw milk in any way she can. Thus there is a prevailing commitment in the raw milk movement to 'spread the word' that pasteurization is bad for your health, and raw milk subsequently, is good for your health and by consuming raw milk, you can achieve an overall better quality of life.

Raw milk activists increasingly rely primarily on their own knowledge when it comes to the health of their children. Liz Reitzig a raw milk activist who was interviewed in the Farmageddon documentary explains that the reason why she became a raw milk activist was very much to do with the fact that the government regulations were stopping her from being able to feed her family what she wanted to. Liz explains “I became a raw milk activist because raw milk was banned in my state. I live in Maryland --when we first started drinking fresh milk we participated in a cow-share program. Now a cow-share is very similar to a time-share where a family will go in together on a cow and then get the milk from their own animal” (F1), subsequently when Liz and her family first started drinking raw milk cow-shares were legal in Maryland, however as Liz explains “but then the health department changed the regulations to ban that” (F1). This in turn provoked a lot of strong feelings in Liz as she

accounts: “That really upset me because here I am trying to feed my children as healthfully as I can and the health department is completely undermining my authority as a parent, all my research, and saying “you don't know what you're doing and you can't give this to your family”” (F1). Problematically, raw milk activists are trying to live as healthy a life as possible, just as Liz Reitzig is trying to feed her children as healthfully as she can, essentially conforming to the normalized role of good parents, however, as the FDA and CDC continue to impose restricting regulations on raw milk, then this in turn, feeds into activists' view that their notion of health fundamentally differs from that of the government, thus they begin to demand new rights and undermine governmental authority. Liz Reitzig concludes that she has had four pregnancies and as she explains “I could smoke through all of them, and yet I can't go to a farm near me and purchase this amazing healthy, nutrient dense fresh milk” (F1). As restrictions have been imposed on the sales of raw milk, raw milk activists have not held back in their view that the government should not be the one to decide what they can consume.

In a testimonial on the Real Milk Website titled 'Raw Milk a Right', Brian and Melody Stutzman from Middlebury, Indiana assert that “The consumption of whole, raw & natural food is & should always be the right of any individual-not to mention all the great health benefits that follow this lifestyle. Being able to partake of pure raw milk coming straight from its source should always be a privilege to any persons own choosing & is his or hers own personal right” (RM1). This is echoed by Sarma Melngailis in the Farmageddon documentary, a restaurant owner who simply states “I think that the freedom to be able to eat what you want is absolutely critical” (F1) and by Jordan S. Rubin an author who states that “We should be able to eat and drink whatever we choose to and feed that to our family” (F1). The tonality of these testimonials are rather peaceful, with raw milk activist's simply articulating their belief that the right, and the freedom to eat what an individual wants to eat should be enjoyed by all.

However, the issue escalates in some of the other testimonials where raw milk activists begin to directly question government interference in matters concerning what people can and cannot eat. In an item of news on the Real Milk Website titled 'Raw Milk Drinker Tells Government to Stay Out of the Kitchen', it is reported how Elizabeth 'a healthy woman in her 50s, who was raised on a diet of farm fresh milk' (RM2) and 'attributes her family's good health to their natural diet' (RM2) is taking a stand and proclaiming “I do not understand where our government gets off thinking they can tell

us what to eat and drink,” she says. “Keep your lab-raised meat, steroid animals and unnaturally raised animals for government officials to eat, and leave [those of us who grew up in the countryside] to live the way we were raised and taught to live.” (RM2). Elizabeth, like most raw milk activists' blames big corporations for government policies on raw milk, and for polluting our food system with 'lab-raised meat', animals who are injected with steroids and what Elizabeth sums up as 'unnaturally raised animals'. As generally raw milk activists are advocating a 'natural' life, when it comes to what they eat and drink, they have thus targeted large corporations who essentially control the foodstuffs market in the US as producing 'unnatural products' which in turn do not conform to the lifestyle which raw milk activists are trying to live.

In a testimonial on the Real Milk website titled 'Raw milk is excellent for health' Joyce Sheets from Arlington Heights, Illinois, who is like many others writing a testimonial on behalf of Richard Heborn, a farmer who was operating a cow-share under Family Farms Cooperative, which subsequently, was stopped after Richard Heborn was accused of distributing raw milk across lines to cow-shareholders (Time Magazine Website 2007). Joyce states “I believe it is shameful that in a FREE COUNTRY we are not respected and left with some amount of dignity before a government entity drops down upon us and confiscates all of our products...and other personal property.” (RM1). Joyce is referring to the large quantities of raw milk which were confiscated by government officials from Richard Heborn. Joyce is proud to declare “I have owned a “Cow Share” for almost two years. I have never felt healthier. I have not had any incidences of illness from this extremely healthy, beneficial, clean and natural product” (RM1). She emphasizes how raw milk is 'extremely healthy', 'beneficial', 'clean' and 'natural' after which she juxtaposes this against dairy produced by large corporations as she asserts “What on earth is the matter with us that we think food can only be good for us after we tweak it, boil it, add preservatives, pasteurize it, irradiate it, and so on” (RM1). Joyce concludes her testimonial, demonstrating her aggravation by switching to capitalized font and proclaiming “PLEASE DO NOT TAKE MY GOD GIVEN RIGHT TO OWN A COW SHARE AND TO DRINK RAW MILK AWAY FROM ME. RAW MILK IS GOOD FOOD. RAW MILK IS EXCELLENT FOR HEALTH. I NEED MY RAW MILK IN ORDER TO STAY HEALTHY AND TO FEEL GOOD” (RM1). She rests her case with her final comment “IF THIS IS INDEED A FREE COUNTRY, I BELIEVE I SHOULD HAVE THE RIGHT TO CHOOSE THE FOOD I WANT TO PUT INTO MY BODY” (RM1). One might mistake Joyce's words as that of a drug addict, seeing as she 'needs' raw milk in order to 'feel good', however, instead she is articulating her justification for

this need, like virtually all of raw milk activists, on the grounds of her health. While simultaneously asserting her *right* to eat what she wants, and her 'god given right' to drink raw milk and own a cow-share.

In the final raw milk testimonial which I will introduce regarding this matter titled 'Commoditization of food supply', Scott Lafond from Royal Oak Minnesota, identifies the normalization of pasteurization and declares "I have been indoctrinated into the general cultural beliefs about pasteurization that we all share...I think it fair to say that the general populace has grown up accepting these notions without ever really checking into the matters for themselves" (RM1). He then asserts that "As an American citizen I demand the right to place into my body the kinds and types of foods I see fit, without the interference of state or federal government" (RM1), yet also considering the motivations of the state as he expresses: "I realize the motivation for the State's actions is to protect the public health and that is truly a noble ambition" (RM1). The overall issue of having the right to drink raw milk for Scott Lafond ties into his fears of how big business is shaping food systems, Scott explains "I fear we have all become too complacent with the commoditization of our food supply as brought about by big business' interest in the bottom line." (RM1). For Scott pasteurization is also to blame as "Pasteurization is a tool that turns a living gallon of milk with finite shelf life into a dead, bar-coded, pale, chalky, shadow of its former self. This manipulation is what transforms food into a commodity for sake of the shelf life it provides" (RM1).

If we consider the prevailing themes which arise from the FDA and CDC material and the raw milk activists' testimonials and interviews then a discourse clearly emerges surrounding competing notions of health, competing notions of health dangers and on the one hand, the government assuming the role of the protector of public health as is articulated in the roles of the FDA and CDC, and on the other hand, raw milk activists who reject this role and instead assume ownership over their own health by asserting their right to choose what food they eat. Evidently, in the educational videos on the FDA and CDC websites, raw milk is securitized to the point that it is not only a health threat, but it can kill you. In the testimonials of raw milk activist's the process of pasteurization is demonized and blamed for causing a range of health problems, and subsequently, deteriorating the quality of life of those whom drink it. This then ties into the competing notions of health presented by both parties which are justified by both on behalf of the better health of the family, and in particularly children. In the FDA and CDC videos, three cases of children who fell terrible ill after consuming raw milk, to the

point where their parents were sure they would die, is used to articulate how raw milk is especially dangerous for children. Furthermore, there is an underlying connotation in the videos that mothers who drink raw milk or give their families raw milk, are essentially “bad”. As in the case of the single mother who risked orphaning her own child by irresponsibly drinking raw milk, at least that was the underlying connotation. The videos are used to securitize drinking raw milk by constructing raw milk as a threat to the American family. Similarly, raw milk activists also use the health of the family and more so, the health of their children as a justification *for* drinking raw milk. One of the mothers essentially attributed her feelings of being a *good* mother due to her ability to provide her family with healthy raw milk.

As the FDA and CDC go to great lengths to securitize raw milk and instead expressing how it is 'important' to only drink pasteurized milk, normalizing the view that raw milk is dangerous and pasteurized milk is safe. The raw milk activists, in turn, explicitly demonize the process of pasteurization and consider it in terms of a health threat, and the source of allergies, and other diseases, which they claim only went away after they began drinking raw milk. Perhaps the final but in a way most prevalent issue which arises in the raw milk discourse is the question of who is responsible for health. The FDA and CDC assert that they have the role of promoting and protecting the health of the public, however, the raw milk activists essentially reject this role and instead assert their own ownership over their health. The raw milk discourse in its essence is biopolitically charged, and comes down to the exercise and resistance of biopower.

#### 4.4 Biopower today: the rise of neoliberalism and questions of circulation

In the *Birth of Biopolitics* Foucault discusses the emergence of what he refers to as neo-liberalism in Germany and the United States after the Second World War, with this discussion he draws conclusions as to what is at stake for modern neo-liberalism. Foucault warns that '...we should not be under any illusion that today's neo-liberalism is—the resurgence of old forms of liberal economics' (Foucault 2008, 117), instead he maintains that 'what is at issue is whether a market economy can serve as the principle, form and model for a state' (Foucault 2008, 117). Subsequently, he is tenacious in his view that neo-liberalism needs to be free of its association with laissez-faire, as unlike previous forms of liberalism which were primarily concerned with exchange, and thus the role of the state was to ensure the freedom of exchange, neo-liberalism is above all concerned with competition (Foucault 2008,

117). This view arises from that of the German Ordoliberals who equate laissez-faire with 'naive liberalism' (Foucault 2008, 119 & 120). Unlike the Physiocrats who relied on a type of natural circulation of goods vis a vis laissez-faire, the Ordoliberals assert that competition is not a given nature (Foucault 2008, 120), thus, the Ordoliberals undermine the 'game of liberalism' and instead articulate the neoliberal "game" of competition as being a '...formal game between inequalities' (Foucault 2008, 120). Pure competition thus becomes the 'essence of the market' and can only be produced—therefore, it needs to be produced by a form of governmentality (Foucault 2008, 121). Thus the problem for neo-liberalism becomes '...how the overall exercise of political power can be modeled on the principles of a market economy' (Foucault 2008, 131), this in turn was accompanied by the view that 'one must govern for the market, rather than because of the market' (Foucault 2008, 121).

The task of neo-liberalism is then to project principles of the market economy on a general art of government, with the problem being no longer which domains one can interfere in and which domains one cannot, as was in traditional liberalism, but instead becomes a problem of how to touch these domains—the issue becomes a matter of governmental style (Foucault 2008, 131 & 132). The role of government thus becomes a role of intervening in order to ensure that the '... competitive mechanisms can play a regulatory role at every moment and every point in society and by intervening in this way its objective will become possible—a general regulation of society by the market' (Foucault 2008, 145). Thus competition in a sense, infects every part of society and economy. Furthermore, a neoliberal society regulated by the market, entails that the '...regulatory principle should not be so much the exchange of commodities as the mechanisms of competition.' (Foucault 2008, 147). Foucault explains how the role of social policy, or *gesellschaftspolitik*, under the Ordoliberals was not to '...nullify anti-social effects of competition; it must nullify the possible anti-competitive mechanisms of society' (Foucault 2008, 160).

As the role of the society changes from what Foucault referred to as being previously reduced to 'the commodity-effect' to becoming subjected to 'the dynamic of competition', society becomes a type of 'enterprise society' (Foucault 2008, 147), and the role of the individual changes also. The neoliberal subject emerges as the homo economicus who subsequently, is '...not the man of exchange or man the consumer; he is the man of enterprise and production' (Foucault 2008, 147), essentially the self emerges itself as an enterprise. Foucault accounts for the notion of the self as enterprise by



considering the relationships of individual life, for example the relationship of family and the relationship of marriage, coupled with the relationship of the individual to their own private property and to for example, insurance. These relationships act to mold the individual into a 'permanent' and 'multiple' enterprise (Foucault 2008, 241). This comes about under the Ordoliberalist *gesellschaftspolitik* which transforms society into a model of enterprise, consisting of enterprises (Foucault 2008, 241). Subsequently, the notion of the self as enterprise is reaffirmed by American neo-liberalism which articulates the relationship of the mother and child as one of an investment. This accounts for the relationship the mother has with the child's eating patterns—and eating, for the neo-liberals this relationship is articulated as an investment—with the income being the child's salary when they reach adulthood (Foucault 2008, 244). Henceforth, the problem of neoliberalism is solved with the emergence of a neoliberal governmentality which entails the self-governance of the individual. As the individual now is an enterprise the individual is always aspiring to achieve maximum utility, maximum well-being and happiness, by taking care of their health and making enough money in order to secure a house, good health, well-being and ultimately happiness. Now I would like to return to the raw milk activists favored cow-share and consider Foucault conceptions of circulation, coupled with his views on neoliberalism.

In light of the prominence of the cow-share in raw milk activists' testimonials, it is important to include an example of how a cow-share, which provides members with raw milk, actually works. Avery's Branch Farms in Virginia, USA, offers raw milk cow-shares. They explain that although 'it is illegal to buy and sell raw milk' in Virginia, 'it is not illegal to drink fresh milk from the cow that you own' (Avery's Branch Farms Website). They also encourage members to 'think of it—owning your own cow and boarding it at a local farm' with the farmer merely providing a service for them by taking care of the cow (Avery's Branch Farms Website). People can join this cow-share by paying 100 dollars for their own cow, along with 35 dollars a month for upkeep. In return they receive a gallon (approximately 3.7 liters) of milk a week.

I think the cow-share is something very interesting to consider in relation to Foucault's ideas on circulation. Although the cow-share is in a sense, selling goods, I think there is grounds to argue that the cow-share does not fit into the mold provided by neoliberalism. Arguably buying and selling existed before neoliberalism, however, it was transformed with neoliberalism and its inherent relationship of competition to becoming an almost uncontrollable force which presented no limits to

the scale which this action of selling could take. As a result the world now has an abundance of multinational giant corporations, and buying and selling, essentially controls our lives. As Foucault discussed, the fundamental purpose of society is now to be ensuring the market—which in turn, means that the fundamental objective of neoliberal governmentality is fostering competition. However, the cow-share is something very different from your regular company. Firstly, they are basically selling a service, but this service, in turn, leads to them becoming the sole provider of milk to its members. This, in turn, means that the members will not be going to the supermarket to buy their milk, implicating that they will not be contributing to the profits of the dairy business. In some cases the cow-share actually is just a group of people who buy a cow together and take turns milking, and share the milk, with no buying or selling whatsoever. Arguably, the latter case poses the biggest threat.

In *Security, territory, population* Foucault uses the example of scarcity of grain in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, to develop the idea of circulation as a technology of security. The scarcity problem was resolved by a 'system of regulations' (Foucault 2007, 53), under which it was for example, prohibited to hoard large amounts of grain and price controls were enforced. This system was developed and used during the mercantilist period of the seventeenth century (Foucault 2007, 53 & 54). In the eighteenth century Physiocrats suppressed both of these prohibitions essentially freeing commerce (Foucault 2007, 60). They adopted the view that with the 'freedom of grain circulation, there cannot be any scarcity' (Foucault 2007, 63) because the market will respond naturally, thus the problem of scarcity disappears (Foucault 2007, 64). The process of eradicating the problem of scarcity entails adopting a '...sort of “laissez-faire” a certain “freedom of movement”—in the sense of “letting things take their course”' (Foucault 2007, 64). Therefore, scarcity is essentially 'allowed' to happen because ultimately the occurrence of scarcity '...will itself entail precisely its own self-curbing and self-regulation' (Foucault 2007, 64).

Foucault's understanding of the apparatuses of security parallels with what he deems 'the game of liberalism'. He maintains that: 'in the apparatus of security...what is involved is precisely not taking either point of view of what is prevented or the point of view of what is obligatory, but standing back sufficiently so that one can grasp the point at which things are taking place, whether or not they are desirable' (Foucault 2007, 69). Instead, there is a reliance on the 'nature' of things or more so, the reality of these things which are taking place, which in turn, becomes the basis upon which the mechanisms of security work, with the main function being to respond to, limit, and regulate this

reality (Foucault 2007, 69) 'The game of liberalism', in turn, according to Foucault is 'not interfering, allowing free movement, letting things follow their course— acting so that reality develops, goes its way, and follows its own course according to laws, principles, and mechanisms of reality itself' (Foucault 2007, 70).

Thus freedom emerges as the basis of liberalism and the basis of the apparatuses of security. Foucault concludes that 'an apparatus of security...cannot operate well except on condition that it is given freedom' (Foucault 2007, 71). However, this 'freedom' needs to be understood in 'the modern sense', that being the way which it becomes shaped in the eighteenth century. For Foucault, freedom entails '...the possibility of movement, change of place, and processes of circulation of both people and things' (Foucault 2007, 71). Subsequently, circulation emerges here as the key notion to understanding freedom. Freedom in turn, conceptualized by Foucault as 'nothing else but the correlative of the deployment of apparatuses of security' (Foucault 2007, 71) becomes explicitly linked to circulation, as Foucault explains '...it is this freedom of circulation, in the broad sense of the term, it is in terms of this option of circulation, that we should understand the word freedom, and understand it as one of the facets, aspects, or dimensions of the deployment of apparatuses of security' (Foucault 2007, 71).

As freedom emerges in terms of the freedom to circulate, thus the 'problem of circulation' manifests itself presenting the problem of 'how should things circulate or not circulate' (Foucault 2007, 92). This involved re-conceptualizing and opening up the town as a place of circulation (Foucault 2007, 27), which in turn presented the problem posed by the town as inherently a conundrum of circulation (Foucault 2007, 27). Subsequently, with the emergence of the problem of circulation, a need arose to organize circulation by allowing circulations to take place, but simultaneously controlling circulations by firstly, defining good circulation and bad circulation, separating dangerous circulation from safe circulation, and secondly by ensuring circulation—ensuring that things are constantly in flux—moving in a way that the fundamental perils of circulation were nullified and the desirable forms of circulation were maximized (Foucault 2007, 34 & 93). The realm of circulation extended from the circulation of ideas, of people, of orders, of wills, of even air to the circulation of merchandise (Foucault 2007, 29 & 51), with bad circulation thus entailing the circulation of for example, thieves and disease, which in turn needed to be minimized (Foucault 2007, 35).

If we consider one of the positively identified forms of circulation, that of the circulation of

commodities then what emerges is the act of ensuring for example, circulation in the form of the circulation of trade within the town (Foucault 2007, 33). Around this time Foucault asserts that 'freedom of commerce and of the circulation of grain began to be laid down as the fundamental principle of economic government' (Foucault 2007, 55), ensuring the circulation of 'merchandise', 'commodities' and 'goods' become stressed in various parts of Foucault's work concerning the objectives of circulation in connection to its emergence in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Thus the circulation of goods, such as in the example of grain, had to be ensured to be of a 'free' nature. The allowance and assurance of the free circulation of goods complied with the emerging liberal economics of the time which relied fundamentally on the policy of *laissez-faire*.

David Harvey in his book *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* defines neoliberalism as '...in the first instance a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade' (Harvey 2005, 2). Thus the principle idea of neoliberalism is that the well-being of human beings should be provided by the market. If we add Foucault's notion of neo-liberalism to this, the notion of competition being the core concern of neo-liberalism, coupled with the pure objective of *gessellschaftspolitik* to be nullifying the anti-competitive mechanisms of society, and instead enforcing a regulatory competitive mechanism on every aspect of society then the cow-share becomes rather problematic for neoliberalism.

If we consider circulation in the context of neoliberalism then arguably, circulation is not based on *laissez-faire*, but instead circulation should be based on competition. Unlike the Physiocrats who relied on 'natural' circulation, neoliberalism relies on intervention to produce the right type of circulation, which is the circulation of competition, as the idea of preserving competition has extended to virtually every aspect of economic and social life. Therefore, the circulation of goods must take place in the market, and the neoliberal market is based on mechanisms of competition, thus an array of regulatory mechanisms must take place in the process of the circulations of goods. Competition entails competitive prices and competitive products. Furthermore, in order for there to be competition and in order for the market to function there needs to be buyers and sellers, in order for the neoliberal conceptions of the circulation of goods to operate. This is the point where the cow-share becomes very problematic for neoliberalism.

Furthermore, considering the fundamental idea of the cow-share, then we can single out the word 'share'. The cow-share is essentially about sharing the milk from a cow. There are growing examples in the raw milk movement of raw milk activists who come together to form a group and collectively buy a cow, and then share the milk. The nature of buying and selling is transformed in the cow-share, and competition is virtually eliminated. The fact that this is increasingly happening out of the market setting on people's private farms, where they are essentially sharing a cow with their friends, without the action of buying and selling the milk conspiring; poses a problem for the essential idea of *gesellschaftspolitik* which entails nullifying anti-competitive behavior, in order to secure the market. Arguably, the cow-share disrupts the circulation of dairy goods, as it removes this circulation from the market setting of buying and selling dairy, to a group of individuals collectively buying a cow, and then essentially sharing the dairy. If we return to the raw milk activists' testimonials there was an increasing resistance against 'store-bought milk' with raw milk activists instead flocking to small farms or more so, investing in cow-shares so that they can have a connection with what they are buying, feeding into the belief system which they have built around consuming raw milk. Big business was identified by most raw milk activists as the culprit for producing "unhealthy" pasteurized milk, along with other foods which raw milk activists condemn to be bad for their health. By demonizing big business, raw milk activist's aim to regulate their consumer behavior in a way that it supports small local farms, thus, they also opt to participate in cow-shares, either privately (among "friends"), or by buying the cow-share from a small business.

There is a fundamental difficulty posed here by the nature of the cow-share, as in order for raw milk activists to participate in one, they have conditions such as that the cow-share needs to be everything that big agricultural farms are not. It needs to be a small farm where the animals can essentially be "happy", where there are conditions which prevent the spread of disease, such as lots of space for the animals to move around, as opposed to big agricultural settings in which raw milk activist's accuse the terrible conditions of having too many animals packed in one space, which in turn causes disease. The nature of the cow-shares consumer-base thus poses a lot of limitations on its ability to grow. Raw milk activists are aggressively against big business and multinational corporations whom they blame for "polluting" their food systems in the first place; thus, turning the cow-share into even a larger chain of cow-shares fundamentally, would not settle well with raw milk activists, especially as they are intent in supporting small local farms, if they choose to buy their dairy at all. Therefore, there is a fundamental limitation when it comes to the ability of the cow-share to illustrate competitiveness

and its economic growth is limited. In a sense it's not a real "money maker".

Arguably the cow-share is subsequently, disrupting neoliberal understanding of the circulation of goods, because the milk is not bought in the traditional sense from a supermarket or another business, instead they have bought a cow and are essentially sharing the milk. This is on a rather small scale, however, as the raw milk movement continues to grow and activists are unable to legally buy raw milk then it is likely that these types of cow-shares will multiply, at least in the states in which they are not banned. This could then in turn, pose an actual problem to the larger dairies which control most of the production of dairy in the United States. Furthermore, there is a fundamentally difficult problem which is posed to the doctrine of neoliberalism which entails that we should rely on the market to secure us in virtually every way. So what will happen if a growing number of people do not participate in the dairy market? I think there is grounds to argue that by disrupting the circulation of dairy goods, with the cow-share, raw milk activists are perhaps unknowingly and unintentionally disrupting what Foucault dubbed the *gesellschaftspolitik* of the Ordoliberalists which entailed nullifying anti-competitive behavior.

The rise of these types of behavior when it comes to obtaining food could have manifold implications for the agricultural market. Certainly, it is hard to imagine that they would be able to be completely free of the market, because they would need to buy seeds and tools in order to begin growing their own food. However, seeing as there is an inherent interest of for example, raw milk activists in the "natural" way, then when the next year came around they would probably cultivate their old seeds, and thus that year would not be buying from the seed market. Subsequently, if they managed to grow enough potatoes in order to sustain them until the next season, they would not have the need to buy any potatoes that season from the store. Thus the potato market would be continually losing business. The idea of subsistence agriculture is on the rise, extending even to urban environments. If we think of cities where buildings ranging from apartment buildings to skyscrapers are beginning to embrace having gardens on their roofs, growing a variety of foods for the buildings' inhabitants, this could entail another disruption in the agricultural market. Moreover, the potential of these micro food movements, including the raw milk movement, is that they are changing how people think about food, and bringing out the possibility, more importantly of changing how people obtain food.

Especially in urban settings, the way people obtain food is through the market. The urban individual

doesn't go outside in the morning and milk the cow, gather eggs from the chicken and then go back inside and makes an omelet. The urban individual goes to a restaurant, or else the urban individual goes to the supermarket and buys eggs and milk, then returns home to make the omelet. Essentially the act of eating, entails, a variety of mechanisms. In order to obtain food, you have to buy it, however, you have to make money in order to be able to buy food. The amount of money you make, then in turn, will regulate what type of food you can buy. In addition to this, as you should be pursuing the maximization of your health and well-being, you should be eating healthy food. Luckily for the urban individual the choice of what constitutes healthy food, or essentially safe food and dangerous food has already been made “up above” and only the “safe” food is available for the individual to buy in the supermarket, thus the individual will buy food from the supermarket which will not pose a danger to their health, and only then will eat it. The act of eating entails a multiplicity of mechanisms. This is essentially the correct circulation of food in accordance with neoliberalism, where, individuals rely on the market on virtually every level of their existence.

This circulation of food, however, has a multiplicity of threats which arise in food movements. If we consider the notion of subsistence farming, which essentially most development policy in developing nations aims to eradicate. Subsistence farming is dangerous to the market, yet with the current surge in food movements and the interest in food production, subsistence farming has become an increasing phenomenon, whether anyone has actually been able to achieve total self-sufficiency is a different matter, arguably, the fact that the overall aim of these movements is to “get back to nature” with many trying to grow as much food themselves as they possibly can, and subsequently, raw milk activist's opting to buy their own cows to milk instead of buying milk from the supermarket. Furthermore, the dangers posed by the raw milk movement to neoliberal governmentality is that raw milk activists also challenge the notion of what is safe food, and what is not—and who decides. Thus they are essentially challenging the circulation of food, from the top to the bottom, from the FDA deciding what food is safe to the monopoly of the supermarket over what food is sold, and further disrupting circulation by essentially not participating in the dairy market. In relation to this I will discuss the concept of food sovereignty in the next chapter.

## 5. The Emergence and Re-conceptualization of Food Sovereignty in the Raw Milk Movement as a Means of Resisting Biopower

The concept of Food Sovereignty emerged in the 1980s in response to the Structural Adjustment Programs (Claeys 2013, 2) which had been imposed on Latin American countries by the International Monetary Fund and World Bank, as these countries were unable to pay back the debt which they had accumulated during the oil years of the late 1970s. As Structural Adjustment Programs famously entailed switching away from state supported agriculture, inevitably American imports began to creep into Latin American countries which led to the need of some sort of food sovereignty. Subsequently, at that time food sovereignty was comprehended in terms of “national food security”, this was also often accompanied by the notion of a “right to continue being producers” (Claeys 2013, 2). It was not until the 1990s that Food Sovereignty was conceptualized as it ‘...emerged in the debates held within La Via Campesina as communities in the Global South and the Global North engaged in a collective struggle to define alternatives to the globalization of a neoliberal, highly capitalized, corporate-led model of agricultural development (Desmarais & Whitman 2013, 3). It was a largely peasant and farmers orientated term to begin with and was widely introduced to the world in 1996 at a civil society conference at the World Food Summit (Desmarais & Whitman 2013, 3).

Currently, eighteen years later the term has become more commonly used by a variety of different groups from first world farmers to peoples in developing nations who have used Food Sovereignty to define their rights. The World Development Movement defines Food Sovereignty as being ‘... about the right of peoples to define their own food systems’ (World Development Movement Website), subsequently, they single out ‘farmers, peasants, pastoralists, fisherfolk, indigenous peoples, women, rural youth and environmental organizations’ (World Development Movement Website) as advocates of food sovereignty. These advocates in turn, place individuals who ‘...produce, distribute and consume food at the centre of decisions on food systems and policies, rather than the demands of markets and corporations that they believe have come to dominate the global food system’ (World Development Website).

In the article *Scaling Biopolitics: Enacting Food Sovereignty in Maine (USA)* Hilda E. Kurtz, Heather Retberg and Bonnie Preston attempt to conceptualize Food Sovereignty within the framework of



biopolitics. They assert that their '...paper traces how the food sovereignties of Maine use politics of scale to face off against biopower as exercised through corporate influence over food and farm regulations' (Kurtz, Retberg & Preston 2013). As discussed earlier the underlying idea behind Food Sovereignty is for people to be able to define their own food systems. In addition to the article *Scaling Biopolitics: Enacting Food Sovereignty in Maine (USA)*, Hilda Kurtz has attempted to conceptualize the raw milk movement in the framework of biopolitics in her previous article *The contested terrain of biological citizenship in the seizure of raw milk in Athens, Georgia* published in 2013. Subsequently, she also uses the example of the right to drink raw milk which falls under Maine's Local Food and Community Self-Governance Ordinance.

Kurtz attempts to validate her argument that 'Maine food sovereignty activists use a politics of scale to face off against biopower as exercised through corporate influence over food and farm regulations' (Kurtz, Retberg & Preston 2013, 3) by using Foucault's notions of biopolitics developed in the work of Nicholas Rose. Furthermore, Kurtz is seeking to conceptualize food sovereignty as a means of resisting biopower as evident in Maine's Local Food and Community Self-Governance Ordinances. Kurtz explains how in 2011 in Maine farmers and food activists drafted a Local Food and Community Self-Governance Ordinance with the intention of protecting small farms, in an economic climate of struggle, by articulating in the ordinance that these small farms should be exempt from inspection and licensure. Furthermore, there was an underlying goal of maintaining food control at the local level and declaring a right to be autonomous from the corporate industrial food system (Kurtz, Retberg & Preston 2013, 1). Kurtz argues that the Ordinance acts a means of resisting biopower as it directly targets '...corporate power within the agricultural system' (Kurtz, Retberg & Preston 2013, 9), which Kurtz in turn articulates as being the source of biopower as she construed in her opening statement of this paper as having the aim to discuss 'how the food sovereignties of Maine use politics of scale to face off against biopower as exercised through corporate influence over food and farm regulations' (Kurtz, Retberg & Preston 2013, 1).

The definition which Kurtz provides of Food Sovereignty is taken from the US Social Forum and entails '...democratic control of the food system, and the right of all people to define their own food systems' (Kurtz, Retberg & Preston 2013, 2). Subsequently, Kurtz Employs the work of Masioli and NicholSEN within which an interview with an activist from the Brazilian Landless Rural Workers Movement leads to food sovereignty being articulated as a problem of biopolitics, according to Kurtz.

In the interview the activist, Itelvina Masioli, articulates Food Sovereignty as '...the right of peoples to decide and produce their own food... a political right to organize ourselves, to decide what to plant, to have control of seeds' (Kurtz, Retberg & Preston 2013, 2 (via Masioli and Nichol森 2011)). Masioli continues to link Food Sovereignty as a concept concerning the sovereignty and autonomy of peoples (Kurtz, Retberg & Preston 2013, 2 (via Masioli and Nichol森 2011)). For Kurtz, Masioli's definition of Food Sovereignty then raises three questions which are: ' How is it that farmers don't have control of the very seeds from which they grow food? Aren't seeds the stuff of life itself? Why does a right to consume one's own food even have to be articulated as a claim such as this?' (Kurtz, Retberg & Preston 2013, 2).

This is the point where Kurtz's own political activism begins to reek through, as she previously already identified herself to basically be a raw milk activist in her article *The contested terrain of biological citizenship in the seizure of raw milk in Athens, Georgia* in which she enclosed that her colleagues and she had their own personal insider relationship to the case of Athens Locally Grown, as they participated in the local food activist community and one of them, subsequently, drank raw milk (Kurtz, Retberg & Preston 2013, 139). Kurtz's questions which pay so much attention to seeds, carry the connotation of her own political activist beliefs concerning the corporation Monsanto's seed Patent laws, which entail that farmers are not allowed to reuse the seeds which they have bought from Monsanto. Subsequently, on a side note, Monsanto is also the same corporation which developed the RBGH milk. The reason I am singling this out is because I think Kurtz's own political activism shines through her work in a negative way, as for example, these questions regarding seeds are not necessarily that relevant to the struggle against biopower. Instead this example acts to portray Kurtz's own personal dismays with corporate power, which perhaps explains why she so randomly identifies corporate power as the source of biopower, without providing any proof to substantiate these claims.

I am not arguing that this claim is completely untrue, however, Kurtz does not provide any citations or other proof to substantiate this claim. For example, she could have referred to Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri who in *Empire* identify how '...only after the second half of the twentieth century did multinational and transnational industrial and financial corporations really begin to structure global territories biopolitically' (Hardt & Negri 2000, 31) which would have substantiated her claim. Instead she randomly articulates 'biopower as exercised through corporate influence over food and farm regulations' in her abstract, without subsequently really returning to this claim in the rest of the article.

Respectively to Hardt and Negri, I wouldn't dare argue that their work on Biopolitics has surpassed Foucault's, and that their notion of biopower as being exercised through multinational and transnational corporations would be common knowledge. Furthermore, I do not see Hardt and Negri's *Empire* in Kurtz list of references, so it really is difficult to validate Kurtz's claims on biopower and her complete lack of references for this claim is a fundamental blunder in her work. I would also argue that although there is a time and place to consider the relationship between multinational corporations and biopower, by only referencing this relationship, the important work which Foucault did on explaining, for example, how the health of the population became an objective of the state, which is one of the reasons why biopower was employed to ensure the health of the population, is completely undermined. This work, subsequently, is imperative when understanding the raw milk debate.

Similarly I find Kurtz use of the term biopolitics to be somewhat problematic. Foucault defines biopolitics in *Society Must Be Defended* as a technology of power which '...exists at a different level, on a different scale, and because it has a different bearing area, and makes use of very different instruments' (Foucault 2003, 242) it deviates from disciplinary power. Foucault also equates biopolitics with biopower (Foucault 2003, 243), discussing the terms synonymously in *Society Must Be Defended*. Therefore, I find it problematic that Kurtz explains that 'Biopolitics entails debate and disagreement over the exercise of biopower' (Kurtz, Retberg & Preston 2013, 6) and that she casually hones to the '...importance of looking carefully at biopolitics as resistance to biopower' (Kurtz, Retberg & Preston 2013, 6) as if it were common knowledge that biopolitics is used as resistance to biopower, when Foucault basically equates biopolitics and biopower in *Society Must Be Defended*.

Returning to Kurtz's argument, that Maine's Local Food and Community Self-Governance Ordinance acts as an instance of Food Sovereignty and a means of resisting biopower, it is apparent that it is largely based on the Local Food and Community Self-Governance Ordinance itself. In the Ordinance declaration, which Kurtz excerpts at length (and also uses italics for emphasis), the food activists and farmers declare 'We the People of [Blue Hill]... have the *right to produce, process, sell, purchase and consume local foods* thus promoting self-reliance, the preservation of family farms, and local food traditions' (Kurtz, Retberg & Preston 2013, 14). They continue to state that 'We recognize that family farms, sustainable agricultural practices, and food processing by individuals, families and non-corporate entities offers *stability to our rural way of life* by enhancing the economic, environmental

and social wealth of our community.' (Kurtz, Retberg & Preston 2013, 14). For these reasons the Ordinance then concludes that '... our right to a local food system requires us to *assert our inherent right* to self-government' (Kurtz, Retberg & Preston 2013, 15), this in turn entails that on the grounds of the town of Blue Hill's '...faith in our *citizens' ability to educate themselves and make informed decisions*. We hold that *federal and state regulations impede local food production and constitute a usurpation of our citizens' right to foods of their choice*' (Kurtz, Retberg & Preston 2013, 15).

Kurtz recognizes in the ordinance, the activists' assertion of their rights to challenge “governmental regimes of truth” by instead maintaining their belief in the ability of the citizens of Blue Hill to make their own decisions regarding the safety of what they eat which Kurtz, in turn, argues are decisions “independent of biopower” (Kurtz, Retberg & Preston 2013, 15). Biopower—which she argues is 'exercised as state and federal regulations that constrain those choices' (Kurtz, Retberg & Preston 2013, 15). Kurtz thus understands the struggle for food sovereignty, as a rights-based struggle. Furthermore, Kurtz firstly articulated the local ordinance into the framework of food sovereignty on the basis of two lawsuits concerning the rights of raw milk activists, which turned the ordinance work into something “fundamentally biopolitical” (Kurtz, Retberg & Preston 2013, 18). Kurtz concludes that 'the galvanizing lawsuits touched a collective nerve regarding limited access to raw milk and helped define the biopolitical stakes of the ordinance effort' (Kurtz, Retberg & Preston 2013, 18). Thus in order for Kurtz to be able to articulate the ordinance into the framework of food sovereignty, she used the raw milk debate as a way to conceive the ordinance in biopolitical terms.

Kurtz bases her argument that the ordinance “faces off biopower” on the success of the ordinance, which she explains spread '...across the political spectrum' (Kurtz, Retberg & Preston 2013, 14) due to the ordinance committee's engagement in the form of “community consultation” with bodies such as the Chamber of Commerce, the County Democrats and the County Republicans who *supported* the ordinance (Kurtz, Retberg & Preston 2013, 14). This is the point where I begin to have fundamental problems with Kurtz's argument.

Firstly, if we consider the concept of food sovereignty, which has been claimed through La Via Campesina as being a concept which entails resisting neoliberalism, by resisting neoliberal trade and agricultural policies, as well as, many other forms of neoliberalism (Alkon 2013, 6), then problems begin to surface. In the article *From Food Sovereignty to Peasants' Rights: an Overview of La Via*

*Campesina's Rights-based Claims over the last 20 years*, Priscilla Claeys asserts that '... food sovereignty has been claimed by La Via Campesina as a collective right' (Claeys 2013, 1) which Claeys in turn, is arguing could become a new human right (Claeys 2013, 1). However, human rights for Louiza Odysseos as she explains in her article *Human Rights, Liberal Ontogenesis and freedom: producing a subject for neoliberalism?* '...attempt to concretise liberalism's commitment to individual freedom and to act as a counterweight against charges that it is the ideology of the market and of the economic status quo, marginalising the poor and disadvantaged' (Odysseos 2010, 747 & 748). Drawing on Foucault Odysseos asserts '...the liberal ontogenesis by human rights now becomes an integral part of governmental practice, while recasting irrevocably the very meaning of freedom itself (Odysseos 2010, 750).

Thus if food sovereignty becomes a human right, then it is reproducing neoliberal practices, which in turn, mean that it cannot resist neoliberalism, as it is itself embedded in neoliberalism. I think this is evident in the fact that the UN has begun to use food sovereignty in relation to indigenous issues (UN Website 2012) as well as, in a report issued by the International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD) which has ties with the World Bank and the UN. In the report a definition of food sovereignty is provided '...as the right of peoples and sovereign states to democratically determine their own agricultural and food policies' (IAASTD Report, 18). Hitherto, food sovereignty was articulated as a means of resisting neoliberalism, however, with the recognition and adoption of food sovereignty by the UN and World Bank then food sovereignty is reframed into a means of producing neoliberalism, in the form of rights and freedoms.

In her article *Self as Enterprise: Dilemmas of Control and Resistance in Foucault's The Birth of Biopolitics* Lois McNay criticizes Foucault's concept of the self as enterprise, as it '...depoliticizes conventional conceptions of individual autonomy' (McNay 2009, 62). This in turn, poses a lot of problems for resistance movements and essentially undermines identity politics as 'individual autonomy becomes not the opposite of, or limit to, neoliberal governance, rather it lies at the heart of its disciplinary control' (McNay 2009, 62). McNay also considers Foucault's views on the danger that rights can be subject to processes of normalization, as Foucault discussed in *Society must be defended*. Rights thus become normalized (McNay 2009, 70) and if this is coupled with McNay's assertion that the exercise of individual autonomy is merely another political technique of neoliberal governance, disguised as freedom, yet simultaneously, reaffirming neoliberalism; then Maine's Local Food and

Community Self-Governance Ordinance, which is essentially rights-based cannot act as a means of resisting biopower, as Kurtz attempts to argue. Kurtz's argument is further invalidated by her statement in which she construes the ordinance's support from the Chamber of Commerce, the County Democrats and the County Republicans as an instance of success for the ordinance which she is simultaneously trying to argue is a means of resisting biopower. Similarly to food sovereignty being adopted by the UN and World Bank, the support of the Chamber of Commerce and the county Republicans and Democrats serves to re-articulate the ordinance into the framework of neoliberalism, thus nullifying it as a means of resisting neoliberalism (although as stated before that argument was invalidated by McNay's interpretations of Foucault's work concerning all individual autonomy and rights-based movements as simply reaffirming neoliberalism in the disguise of freedom).

Julie Guntham in her article *Neoliberalism and the making of food politics in California*, like many others, has criticized food movements for reproducing neoliberal governmentality. Guntham asks the question 'How it is that current arenas of activism around food and agriculture seem to produce and reproduce neoliberal forms and spaces of governance, at the same time they oppose neoliberalism writ large?' (Guntham 2008, 1172) to which she poses another *quite comical* question: is it 'a failure of imagination?' (Guntham 2008, 1172). Guntham maintains that '...projects in opposition to neoliberalizations of the food and agricultural sectors appear to have uncritically taken up ideas of localism, consumer choice, and value capture – ideas which seem standard to neoliberalism' (Guntham 2008, 1174). Her concerns also lie in the manner which food activists use consumer choice as a means of resistance. Guntham pays particular interest to the local food movement in California, which subsequently has been framed as a means of resisting globalization by favoring local food products, which in turn will ensure the competitiveness of California in the world economy (Guntham 2008, 1180). Guntham concludes that '...in keeping with neoliberalism's tendency to unleash competitive logistics—protective localisms produce competition, as well' (Guntham 2008, 1176).

If we now consider Kurtz argument, which relies on Maine's Local Food and Community Self-Governance Ordinance as a means of resisting biopower, then in the document we see the themes which Guntham just explained being used as a justification for the ordinance, when in reality as Guntham herself might argue, the ordinance is actually reproducing neoliberal forms. Firstly, if we consider the language which is used to articulate the rights of the food activists and farmers behind the ordinance, then it is evident that they are in a sense speaking in a neoliberal language. They assert

'We the People of [Blue Hill]... have the *right to produce, process, sell, purchase and consume local foods* thus promoting self-reliance, the preservation of family farms, and local food traditions' (Kurtz, Retberg & Preston 2013, 14). The words "purchase", "sell", "produce" and "consume" all relate to the market, furthermore, the use of "local foods" carries the connotation which Guntham explained, of protectionist measures aiming at protecting the local economy by consuming local foods. Secondly, the ordinance explicitly states that their aim is that of 'enhancing the economic—wealth of our community' (Kurtz, Retberg & Preston 2013, 14) which they intend to achieve through their 'right to a local food system' (Kurtz, Retberg & Preston 2013, 14).

The conclusions which emerge from the ordinance is that basically *gesellschaftspolitik* is working. The language of purchasing and consuming—selling and producing, coupled with the aim to enhance the wealth of their community illustrates that in the ordinance the food activists and farmers are simply serving neoliberalism in their wish to be competitive. It all comes down to competition. As was previously discussed pure competition becomes the 'essence of the market' and can only be produced—therefore, it needs to be produced by a form of governmentality (Foucault 2008, 121), furthermore, as Foucault asserted 'one must govern for the market, rather than because of the market' (Foucault 2008, 121). Thus it appears that what was articulated as resistance, has come full circle and Maine's Local Food and Community Self-Governance Ordinance is trapped in neoliberalism. Unlike Kurtz has claimed, it has not the ability nor the inclination to "face off biopower".

Subsequently, the argument which Kurtz was relying on—that raw milk farmers would fall under the ordinance and thus would be exempt from government regulations—is also undermined as it was reported by NPR on June 21<sup>st</sup> 2013. One of the raw milk lawsuits against a Maine raw milk farmer, which Kurtz relied on to conceptualize the Maine ordinance in the framework of biopolitics, Farmer Brown, was fined for selling raw milk and as Maria Godoy explains 'Brown's case has been seen widely as a test of the legality of Maine's local food sovereignty revolution: Brown had claimed that Blue Hill's local food ordinance exempted him from state licensing and labeling regulations. The state disagreed, and so did the judge (NPR Website 2013). Therefore, raw milk farmers do not fall under the ordinance, which mainly because of them is why Kurtz articulated the ordinance as a means to "face off" biopower. In light of what I have discussed, I have no choice but to conclude that Kurtz's argument is invalid. However, I think there is an argument to make on behalf of food sovereignty as a means of resisting biopower, albeit, it needs to be re-conceptualized to do so.

In *The History of Sexuality* Volume one, as it is often said, Foucault famously claimed—perhaps now it is necessary to state that Foucault infamously claimed that where there is power there is resistance (Foucault 1978, 95). Although Lois McNay argues in her article *Self as Enterprise: Dilemmas of Control and Resistance in Foucault's The Birth of Biopolitics* that as Foucault develops the self as enterprise he manages to undermine resistance by conceptualizing the autonomy of the individual as another technique of neoliberal governmentality, coupled with his assertions that rights are subject to normalization in *Society must be defended*, McNay also considers Foucault's other work which offers the possibility of resistance. In particular McNay singles out Foucault comments in the interview which was titled *The Social Triumph of the Sexual Will*, which I will now discuss further.

In the interview the subject falls on to the matter of homosexual rights, and incidentally the meaning of rights. Foucault asserts that 'a right, in its real effects, is much more linked to attitudes and patterns of behavior than to legal formations' (Foucault 1997, 157) which is why he suggests that homosexuals will still be discriminated against even if that discrimination is illegal. Instead Foucault proposes that we need to create new cultural forms, for example, by creating homosexual lifestyles (Foucault 1997, 157). He continues to explain that if '...in the name of respect for individual rights someone is allowed to do as he wants, great—but if what we want to do is to create a new way of life, then the question of individual rights is not pertinent' (Foucault 1997, 158). Thus, in order for us to resist—by using rights—then rights need to be re-imagined into something new. Foucault maintains that 'rather than arguing that rights are fundamental and natural to the individual, we should try to imagine and create a new relational right that permits all possible types of relations to exist and not be prevented, blocked, or annulled by impoverished relational institutions' (Foucault 1997, 158). Furthermore, we need to create new cultural forms, which in turn, rely on a number of variables. Foucault then suggests what these variables may be in his discussion of his interest in gay culture as he explains: 'I mean culture in the large sense, a culture that invents ways of relating, types of existence, types of values, types of exchanges between individuals which are really new and are neither the same as, nor superimposed on, existing cultural forms' (Foucault 1997, 158 & 159).

In light of Foucault's more hopeful position on the possibilities of resistance in his other work, compared to his notions of the self as enterprise in the *Birth of Biopolitics*, I think there is grounds to make an argument that not only does resistance exist, but that resistance emerges in the form of food sovereignty in the raw milk movement. Subsequently, I argue that the emergence and re-



conceptualization of food sovereignty in the raw milk movement constitutes a means of resisting biopower. In order for food sovereignty to constitute a means of resisting biopower it needs to be re-conceptualized into something new—something which does not correspond to the conceptualization of food sovereignty made by La Via Campesina which subsequently was adopted by the UN .

In the analysis of the material consisting of raw milk activists' testimonials and other interviews, what emerged was a belief system surrounding raw milk, and drinking raw milk became a lifestyle, a conception of reality, which subsequently competes with the reality which is being constructed by the FDA and CDC, aka the state. One might even go so far as to argue they are producing *new cultural forms* as the raw milk activist's belief system and lifestyle, parallels Foucault's discussion on the gay rights movement, in that they are producing an alternative lifestyle to that of the neoliberal lifestyle by presenting competing notions of health, competing notions of pasteurization and challenging neoliberal conceptions of circulation and in that the whole neoliberal conception of the food system. Furthermore, the way in which the raw milk activists are resisting neoliberal biopower, is done not simply through words, but through action.

The very act of drinking raw milk entails ownership over one's body. Arguably they are exercising food sovereignty in the very act of drinking raw milk. The act of drinking milk holds manifold messages of resistance, by drinking raw milk, raw milk activists are directly rejecting and discrediting the role of the government as protector and promoter of health; rejecting the governments notions of what is safe and what is dangerous in the framework of health; they are rejecting pasteurization and with that multinational corporations, and they are fundamentally asserting their ownership over their individual body, entailing their own notions of health to be truth, and by doing so discrediting the government.

They are exercising food sovereignty by creating their own alternative reality which ranges from what consist healthy foods, what consist dangerous foods and furthermore, how food should be produced, and how food should be obtained. By constructing an alternative reality to that of neoliberalism, food sovereignty becomes a means of resisting biopower. As was discussed earlier in relation to circulation, I concluded that raw milk activist's succeed in disrupting the neoliberal circulation of foodstuffs, by participating in cow-shares, which are inherently uncompetitive—especially when they are simply a group of people sharing a cow, and subsequently, its milk. This coupled with their competing notions

of health means that they are essentially challenging the circulation of food, from the top to bottom, from the FDA deciding what food is safe to the monopoly of the supermarket over what food is sold, and further disrupting circulation by essentially not participating in the dairy market.

Moreover, it is also important to consider the belief system which surrounds drinking raw milk as a whole, seeing as it contains other factors which can be problematic for neoliberal governmentality. Namely the aspect of the belief system which entails eating natural food which is grown in the most natural way, this entails growing as much food yourself—which subsequently, many raw milk activist's aspire to do. This type of subsistence farming, although it now remains mainly as a goal for raw milk activists, still has the possibility of posing problems for neoliberal conceptions of the circulation of goods in the long run. As I mentioned in my analysis of circulation I think there is grounds to argue that by disrupting the circulation of dairy goods, with the cow-share, raw milk activists are perhaps unknowingly and unintentionally disrupting what Foucault dubbed the *gesellschaftspolitik* of the Ordoliberals which entailed nullifying anti-competitive behavior. Similarly by participating increasingly in subsistence farming, they are continuing to disrupt *gesellschaftspolitik*, by producing anti-competitive behavior.

In this thesis food movements have been subjected to criticism on the grounds that they reproduce neoliberal governmentality and other forms. Therefore, there is a danger that many of these criticisms could also be applied to the raw milk movement, especially as the raw milk movement implements aspects such as Healthism and localism. However, there are also arguments to be made on behalf of these notions, in that they did exist in some ways before neoliberal governmentality—and even governmentality, which is why they can also exist outside of neoliberalism today. If we firstly consider the aspect of Healthism, under which ensuring the individuals health is the sole responsibility of the individual coupled with Foucault notions of the body becoming the site of power, in that the health of the population became the concern of the state in that it recognized the need to produce a healthy labor force, which is why behaviors were encouraged which ensured the health of the population and namely the health of the family.

However, arguably, the individual interest of promoting one's health, along with the interest in the health of the child existed long before they were implemented in to techniques of governance, which it should suffice simply to reference the wide varieties of ancient medicine and the simple fact that

humanity survived until the eighteenth century. Therefore, the interest of individuals to promote their health coupled with the interest of parents to promote and protect the health of their children which raw milk activists use as a justification for drinking raw milk, in this case can be considered to be outside the realm of biopower. Furthermore, one might argue that it is a fundamental malfunction of biopower that raw milk activists have basically hijacked the concept of the health of individuals and the health of the family to justify their competing reality.

Another aspect which surfaces in the raw milk movement is localism, which subsequently, was used as a means to criticize food movements as reproducing neoliberal forms. However, that criticism lied mainly on the protectionist nature of localism which was evident in Guntham's criticism of the Californian local food movement, which by resisting globalization through localism, was in fact a means for producing protectionism for one of the largest exporters of agriculture in the US and in the criticisms of Maine's Local Food and Community Self-Governance Ordinance the local aspect was used by the ordinance as a means of producing economic *wealth* for the community.

However, if we consider the raw milk movement then the way that localism is used is somewhat different. Localism after all does have other culturally significant aspects, such as that of wanting to have foods produced locally which have been eaten and produced locally for hundreds or even thousands of years. Furthermore, there is also the aspect of wanting to know where the food comes from and under what conditions they are produced, which corresponds to the belief system which is built in the raw milk movement around knowing where your food comes from, and the process from start to finish—subsequently, knowing that your food is produced in a natural way. By supporting local farmers raw milk activists get to in a way be a part of the process of the production of their food, as they often buy straight from the farm, which means that they have a chance to see and interact with for example, the cows from which their milk comes. This is further conceptualized in the cow-share, which many raw milk activist's belong to, which in order to survive needs to be local—as raw milk cannot withstand traveling for long distance—and raw milk activist's need this close connection to their food, in order to validate their belief that food needs to be produced in the most natural way, thus by seeing how their food is produced, they can ensure that they are only eating naturally produced food.

Food sovereignty, as exercised in the raw milk movement, enables the construction of alternative

conceptions of health, alternative conceptions of whom has the authority over health, as well as, alternative conceptions of the role of government when it comes down to matters of health. Furthermore, it enables alternative conceptions to the ways food is produced and obtained. Raw milk activists, by drinking raw milk, are subsequently taking ownership of their bodies—and taking the risk of getting seriously ill or even dying when drinking raw milk. There is a type of fanaticism in their testimonials, or even you might argue that they speak of it as if it were some type of religion—their religion—morbidly—by accepting the risk of death from drinking raw milk they become free—by accepting death they become free. Our lives are governed in a way that we have come to fear death, which is why we live are lives avoiding death, avoiding getting sick, avoiding things which are bad for us—although many still smoke and drink yet they will have a sense of guilt in doing so, because essentially it is *wrong* to neglect your health. If they truly believe that raw milk is good for their health, raw milk gives them a better quality of life—should the decision of drinking raw milk then not be their own—should they not be able to make the decision without the guilt of endangering their health. If you look at the statistics people in the US have a high chance of dying from heart disease and cancer—even if they strived to live the healthiest life possible.

If we put these fundamentally romanticist notions aside and instead return to Foucault's main criticism of rights, that they can be normalized, and furthermore, they are just another instance of freedom which is at the heart of neoliberal governmentality. Arguably the right to drink raw milk, and subsequently, the cow-share cannot become normalized in a way that they would serve neoliberal governmentality because namely the right to drink raw milk has the inherent danger of producing death, and the nature of the cow-share is inherently anti-competitive.

If we consider what is happening in the US at the moment when it comes to legalizing Marijuana, as states such as Washington and Colorado are legalizing the sale of Marijuana for medical use, as well as, relaxing its criminalization, we might ask why not nationally legalize the sale of raw milk. The sentiment among raw milk activists who have been in a situation where the FDA has intervened and confiscated raw milk which was being distributed across state lines, or seized raw milk from farms which they deemed unfit for human consumption, is that they are being treated like drug dealers—which to them is ludicrous and surreal. However, arguably the use of Marijuana for *medical* purposes has the possibility of becoming a norm, which even the state might adopt, as unlike raw milk if you smoke one joint of Marijuana there is not a risk that you will die, however, if you drink a glass of raw

milk, according to the US government, you could die. Drinking raw milk can produce death, but smoking Marijuana cannot. Furthermore, the legalization of Marijuana in states such as Colorado promise up to an estimate of over 100 million a year in tax revenue (The New York Times 2014), however, if we consider the history of the raw milk debate then what emerges is that it was not until the birth of the dairy as a result of industrialization in the middle of the nineteenth century that raw milk began to be so diseased, this coupled with the fact that today's news is constantly reporting stories of outbreaks of disease from raw milk, proves that raw milk is a product which cannot handle mass production. In some ways the problem of raw milk is that it cannot be capitalized, at least not at the mass level because it is simply too dangerous. This is why raw milk activists are arguing that it is inherently safe when it comes from their cow-shares or small farms, because it cannot withstand mass production. Therefore, it cannot offer what the legalization of Marijuana can.

Raw milk activists do not need an ordinance or even necessarily a law to ensure food sovereignty because they are arguably exercising food sovereignty by drinking raw milk and by doing so, opposing the role of the government as the “protector” of public health. Raw milk activists are not going to stop drinking raw milk even if the government deems it as dangerous to their health, they will not stop drinking raw milk even if the laws intervene with the sales of raw milk and the legality of the cow-share. They will find a way to obtain and drink raw milk regardless of any governmental or legal action because they have constructed a belief and value system around drinking raw milk. For them it has become *a way of life* which is structured around drinking raw milk. This is why the behavior of raw milk activist's has become so dangerous for neoliberal governmentality—as it directly resists biopower—but also neoliberalism, by adhering to alternative conceptions of health and presenting alternative ways of obtaining food. To sum things up it is constructing an alternative reality—new cultural forms—than that of neoliberal democracies, and once it has been set in motion, there is no turning back.

## 6. Conclusion

In this thesis it has been argued that the concept of food sovereignty, as currently defined, does not manage to meet its objective of resisting neoliberalism. Furthermore, the arguments of academics whom have claimed that food movements are examples of resisting neoliberalism, have been questioned and deconstructed to prove that they not only fail at doing this, but also attempt to articulate resistance of neoliberalism by reproducing neoliberal governmentality. The work of Hilda Kurtz has also been subjected to criticism, as although she tried to conceptualize food sovereignty as a means of resisting biopower, her arguments were weak due to her poor understanding of Foucauldian biopolitics. Subsequently, similarly to her peers, her work also remained stuck in the cycle of neoliberalism, with her arguments of resisting neoliberalism and biopower, only managing to reproduce neoliberal forms of governmentality in disciplinary mechanisms which lie at the heart of neoliberal power, but are disguised as freedoms.

Although one of the main purposes of this thesis was to deconstruct the arguments which claimed that food sovereignty, as currently defined, was a means of resisting neoliberalism, which subsequently were proven to be invalid; another purpose of this investigation was to prove that food sovereignty could act as a means of resisting biopower, and subsequently be a means of at least challenging neoliberal governmentality, however, in order to do so it was argued that it needed to be re-conceptualized into something new, which didn't fall into the cycle of neoliberal governmentality. Thus the argument has been made that food sovereignty is re-conceptualized in the raw milk movement and therefore, becomes a means of resisting biopower, furthermore, it is argued that neoliberal governmentality is also challenged in the raw milk movement, falling under the re-conceptualization of food sovereignty.

These arguments have been in keeping with Foucault's very limited work on resistance, which suggested that in order to resist we need to create new cultural forms. In the material analysis of the raw milk activist's testimonials, what emerged was a belief system surrounding raw milk a competing reality than that of the US government, something which might even be deemed a new cultural form. This belief system entailed competing notions of health than that of the government, competing notions of pasteurization, as well as, challenging neoliberal conceptions of circulation, and challenging neoliberal conceptions of the food system from top to bottom, and instead, offering an

alternative way of producing and obtaining food in the cow-share. I have argued that by participating in cow-shares, raw milk activists are disrupting what Foucault dubbed the *gesellschaftspolitik* of the Ordoliberals which entailed nullifying anti-competitive behavior. They are exercising food sovereignty by creating their own alternative reality which ranges from what consist healthy foods, what consist dangerous foods and furthermore, how food should be produced, and how food should be obtained. By constructing an alternative reality to that of neoliberalism, food sovereignty becomes a means of resisting biopower. Furthermore, as the belief system surrounding raw milk entails a certain romanticism about natural food which is accompanied the dream of being able to achieve a type of subsistence farming, they are continuing to disrupt *gesellschaftspolitik*, by producing a rhetoric which entails anti-competitive behavior.

The hyperbole employed by raw milk activists' in their testimonials may lead us to reduce them to being an overtly comical group of activist extremists tortured with their first world problems of not being able to get the right kind of milk. However, to reduce them to that would be a mistake, as the hyperbolic language which is employed in their testimonials serves a purpose—it serves to show how resistance to biopower transpires in the form of such a mundane issue, as that of milk. This mundane issue in turn led to an entire movement which served to challenge the neoliberal conceptions of how food is produced and whose role is it to ensure the health of the American population. Arguably this exemplifies the fact that if we are even going to approach resistance to biopower and neoliberal governmentality, we should start at the micro level, as mundane issues such as milk can serve to illustrate the platform where the exercise of biopower, and the resistance of biopower, meet.

To simply reduce food movements to being an expression of first world elitism plagued with the problem of *what to eat*, would fail to see the potential of these food movements of constituting a means of challenging neoliberal governmentality, and in some cases resisting biopower. I think a fascinating example would be that of Detroit. A city once renowned for its automobile industry and fast growth symbolizing American capitalist might, yet now left to urban decay; with the white middle and upper classes deserting it leaving a majority of black poor people who are seeing an urban city, once the might of capitalism, deteriorating before their eyes, with nature taking over empty lots which once constituted suburbia—and the subsequently the American dream. There is a really interesting phenomenon of poor people living in the suburbs, which look almost like farm land due to the many houses which have either been burned down by vandals, or taken down for safety reasons, what is

transpiring is truly fascinating. Nature is taking over what previously was suburbia, and the poor who still live there have taken to begin farming the land—building small community gardens on empty lots and then feeding their community with the produce, for free (The Guardian 2010). Although this is at a very micro level, and subsequently, some have envisioned capitalizing on the idea and turning Detroit's empty lots into industrial farms, it still is rather remarkable. These people have virtually been failed by the market in every way and have turned to nature to feed themselves. For those who still live in these areas then the food alternatives probably constitute fast food chains, furthermore, seeing as they are mostly unemployed they cannot afford any other food than fast food (if even that), which many have turned away from in favor of their community gardens, looking at what the market has to offer them and saying no, instead they have taken over empty lots and began to initiate a type of subsistence farming. Therefore, food movements should not be simply reduced to first world elitism, as there are different forms and different aspects which need to be taken into account. Furthermore, people are also starving in the “greatest county in the world”—as the market has failed them in more ways than one, which in turn, will spark these types of food movements, be it out of an interest to live as naturally as possible, as in the raw milk movement or be it out of survival, as in the Detroit “local” food movement.

A conscious choice was made in conducting this investigation not to discuss or consider the role of multinational and transnational corporations when it came to the legislation of raw milk, this is because it was not necessary as the history provided illustrated the interest of the state in the health of the population, and furthermore, it illustrated how raw milk in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was responsible for high infant mortality and multiple diseases affecting the American population. However, if in the future if a more Hardian and Negrian approach was taken, entailing that biopower is exercised through these corporations then it would be interesting to consider for example, why there are so many conflicts between the American FDA approved chemicals such as rBGH and for example, EU legislation which prohibits the use of rBGH. It would also be interesting to consider how Foucault's notions of the object of the state as achieving an optimal health of the population has changed. Arguably, the history which Foucault provided in which he argued that a healthy population was seen more as a productive labor force concerned the nineteenth century, when physical labor was at its peak. However, physical labor is no longer required of all, but more so of a limited few. In order for people to be able to work, they do not necessarily need to have optimal physical health, and subsequently, most people today have a health condition of some sort, yet this



doesn't mean that they will die or be unable to continue working, instead they will be medicated probably for the rest of their lives. If we play around with this notion of governing for the market, and that biopower is exercised by multinational and transnational corporations then it really does become fascinating to consider that things may have changed when it comes to the health of the population. There is a multibillion dollar business formulated on the assumption that people are continuing to get sick and continuing to get diseases such as cancer and heart disease. Subsequently, the way cancer is perceived is that deaths from cancer have gone down, because of medical breakthroughs, which in turn lead to successes in that people live longer than the so-called five year survival rate, yet this does not mean that people contracting cancer has not increased. Many argue how such little money is put into prevention research, and instead only put into the "cure". However, if the objection was a population with the most optimal health, then logically prevention would be key, however, that would in turn topple over a multibillion dollar industry. This is just speculation and simply putting these questions out there, as the point which I am trying to make is that there are activists, such as the raw milk activists who have these types of views, that the food industry is "polluting" their food system, causing them to get sick and this view, in turn, sparked a micro revolution.

The main issue to consider in light of all that has been discussed in this thesis is that the market has failed a great deal of people, and this in turn will lead individuals to question neoliberal governance, however, most resistance movements as was argued fail to escape neoliberalism, and instead are stuck in the cycle of neoliberalism which is ruled by the market. Yet what emerges in the raw milk movement is an alternative to resistance as well, with their alternative belief system which entails living a healthy and natural life, which unintentionally managed to challenge neoliberal governmentality, resist biopower and ultimately escape neoliberalism. Subsequently, the example of Detroit served to illustrate that neoliberal governmentality is being challenged, albeit, unintentionally on multiple platforms and especially when it comes to food production, food regulation and the means of obtaining food. The fact that people with very little means opted to grow food in a type of guerilla movement on vacant land, instead of crossing the street to go to McDonalds is actually quite remarkable, illustrating how the market has failed them and continues to fail them, which has led them to find an alternative.

## References

### Primary sources:

(FDA1)=Federal Drug Administration Website, “About”. Source:  
<http://www.fda.gov/AboutFDA/Transparency/Basics/ucm194877.htm>. Accessed April 28<sup>th</sup> 2014.

(FDA2)= Federal Drug Administration Website Video “The Dangers of Unpasteurized Milk”  
 Source:  
<http://www.fda.gov/Food/ResourcesForYou/consumers/ucm079516.htm#video>. Accessed April 28<sup>th</sup> 2014.

(CDC1)=Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Website, “Mission” Source:  
<http://www.cdc.gov/about/organization/mission.htm>. Accessed April 28<sup>th</sup> 2014.

(CDC2)=Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Website “Real stories of the dangers of raw milk”. Source:  
<http://www.cdc.gov/foodsafety/rawmilk/raw-milk-videos.html>. Accessed April 28<sup>th</sup> 2014.

(RM1)= Real Milk Website Testimonials. Source: <http://www.realmilk.com/testimonials/>. Accessed April 28<sup>th</sup> 2014.

(RM2)=Real Milk Website. Source: <http://www.realmilk.com/raw-milk-drinker-tells-government-to-stay-out-of-the-kitchen/#more-5441>. Accessed April 28<sup>th</sup> 2014.

(RIL1)= Rejoice in Life Website Testimonials: Source:  
[www.rejoiceinlife.com/feedback/rawMilkTest.php#AbbyEagle](http://www.rejoiceinlife.com/feedback/rawMilkTest.php#AbbyEagle). Accessed April 28<sup>th</sup> 2014.

(F1)= Farmageddon documentary 2011.

### Literature:

Bray, Una (2000) *New York Milk Culture: Some History, Facts and Concerns*, From the Book: *Milk: beyond the dairy: Proceedings of the Oxford Symposium on food and cookery 1999*, Edited by Harlan Walker, p.98-106, Prospect Books 2000.

Foucault, Michel (1978) *The History of Sexuality Volume 1*. Translated from the French by Robert Hurley, Pantheon Books New York 1978.

Foucault, Michel (1997) *Ethics, Subjectivity and Truth: The Essential Works of Foucault*. Translated by Robert Hurley and Others. The New Press New York 1997

Foucault, Michel (2001) *Power: The Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984*. Translated by Robert Hurley and Others. The New Press New York 2001.

Foucault, Michel (2003) *Society Must be Defended: Lectures at the College de France, 1975-76*. Translated by David Macey. Picador 2003

Foucault, Michel (2007) *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College de France, 1977-78*. Translated by Graham Burchell. Palgrave Macmillan 2007.

Foucault, Michel (2008) *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège De France 1978-1979*. Translated by Graham Burchell. Palgrave Macmillan 2008.

Gee, James Paul (2001) *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis. Theory and Method*. Routledge London & New York 2001.

Given, Lisa M. (2008) *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods Volumes 1 & 2*. Sage Publications Inc 2008.

Goheen, Peter G. (1996) *Industrialization and the growth of cities in nineteenth century America*. From the book: *Urbanization and the growth of cities*. By Neil L. Shumsky. New York: Routledge, 1996.

Hardt, Michael & Negri, Antonio (2000) *Empire*. Harvard University Press 2000.

Harvey, David (2005) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.

Johnstone, Barbara (2002) *Discourse Analysis*. Blackwell Publishing 2002.

Jorgensen, Marianne & Phillips, Louise J. (2002) *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. Sage Publications 2002.

Rose N. Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1999

Smith-Howard, Kendra (2014) *Pure and Modern Milk: An Environmental History Since 1900*. Oxford University Press 2014.

Swedlund, Alan C. & Donta, Allison K. (2003) *Scarlet fever epidemics in the nineteenth century: a case of evolved pathogenic virulence?* From the book *Human Biologists in the Archives: demography, health, nutrition and genetics in historical populations*. Edited by D. Ann Herring & Alan C. Swedlund. Cambridge University Press 2003.

Ward, John W. & Warren, Christian (2006) *Silent Victories: The History and Practice of Public Health in Twentieth-century America*. Oxford University Press 2006.

E-books:

Smith-Howard, Kendra (2014) *Pure and Modern Milk: An Environmental History Since 1900*. Oxford University Press 2014, E-book.

## Academic Journals, Conference papers, and reports:

Alkon, Alison Hope (2013) *Food Justice, Food Sovereignty, and the Challenge of Neoliberalism*. Conference paper for Food Sovereignty: A Critical Dialogue, International Conference at Yale University in affiliation with The Journal of Peasant Studies.

Allen, P. W. (1916) *Comparison of the Rate of Multiplication of Bacteria in Raw Milk with the Rate in Pasteurized Milk*. The Journal of Infectious Diseases, Vol. 19, No. 5 (Nov., 1916), pp. 721-728  
Published by: Oxford University Press.

Blue, Gwendolyn (2010) *Food, Publics, Science*. Public Understanding of Science 2010.

Claeys, Priscilla (2013) *From Food Sovereignty to Peasants' Rights: an overview of La Via Campesina's Rights-based claims over the last 20 years*. Conference paper for Food Sovereignty: A Critical Dialogue, International Conference at Yale University in affiliation with The Journal of Peasant Studies.

Crawford, Richard (1980) *Healthism and the Medicalization of Everyday Life*. International Journal of Health Services 10 (3): 365-88.

Czaplicki, Alan (2007) *"Pure Milk is Better Than Purified Milk" Pasteurization and Milk Purity in Chicago, 1908-1916*. Social Science History 2007, Volume 31, Number 3: 411-433.

Desmarais, Annette & Whitman, Hannah (2013) *Farmers, Foodies and First World Nations: Getting to Food Sovereignty in Canada*. Conference paper for Food Sovereignty: A Critical Dialogue, International Conference at Yale University in affiliation with The Journal of Peasant Studies.

Graham, Linda J. (2005) *Discourse Analysis and the critical use of Foucault*. Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education annual conference in Sydney 27<sup>th</sup> November to 1<sup>st</sup> December 2005.

Guntham, Julie (2008) *Neoliberalism and the making of food politics in California*. Geoforum 39, (2008) 1171-1183.

Holsinger, V.H., Rajkowski, K.t. & Stabel, J.R. (1997) *Milk pasteurization and safety: a brief history and update*. Rev. sci. tech. Off. int. Epiz., 1997, 16 (2), 441-451.

International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD) Global Summary for Decision Makers Report 2008.

Kurtz, Hilda.; Trauger, Amy.& Passidomo, Catarina (2013) *The contested terrain of biological citizenship in the seizure of raw milk in Athens, Georgia*. Geoforum 48, 136-144.

Kurtz, Hilda E.; Retberg, Heather & Preston, Bonnie (2013) *Scaling Biopolitics: Enacting Food Sovereignty in Maine (USA)*. Conference paper for Food Sovereignty: A Critical Dialogue, International Conference at Yale University in affiliation with The Journal of Peasant Studies.

Lynch, Michael (2013) *Ontography: Investigating the production of things, deflating ontology*. Social Studies of Science 2013 43: 444.

Maheshwari, Raaz (2012) *Genetically Modified Foods: An Insight*. International Journal of Life Sciences Biotechnology and Pharma research, Vol. 1, No.3, July 2012, Editorial.

McNay, Lois (2009) *Self as Enterprise: Dilemmas of Control and Resistance in Foucault's The Birth of Biopolitics*. Theory, Culture and Society 26 (6) 2009.

Odysseos, Louiza (2010) *Human Rights, Liberal Ontogenesis and freedom: producing a subject for neoliberalism?* Millenium: Journal of International Studies Volume 38, number 3, 2010, p.747-772.

Public Health Reports (1920) *Health Milk Pasteurization Ordinance Upheld*. Public Health Reports (1896-1970), Vol. 35, No. 31 (Jul. 30, 1920), p. 1801 Published by: Association of Schools of Public Health.

Randolph, N. A. (1884) *Sciences On the Digestion of Raw and of Boiled Milk*, Proceedings of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, Vol. 36 (1884), p. 120.

Weisbecker, Andy (2007) *A Legal History of Raw Milk in the United States*. Journal of Environmental Health, Volume 69, Number 8, 2007.

Williams, Anna W. & Gurley, Caroline R. (1931) *Milk-borne septic sore throat and Scarlet Fever and their relation to Beta Hemolytic Stretococci*. Assisted by Eva Sobel and Margaret Castelda, From the Bureau of Laboratories of the New York City Health Department Received for publication July 27, 1931.

## News Articles:

Digital Journal Website, *Bipartisan bills would lift restrictions on US raw milk sales*. By Martin Laine, published April 6<sup>th</sup> 2014. <http://digitaljournal.com/life/health/bipartisan-bills-would-lift-restrictions-on-us-raw-milk-sales/article/379795> Accessed April 20<sup>th</sup> 2014.

Forbes Magazine, *Police raid rawsome foods, dump raw milk*. By Erik Kain published August 3<sup>rd</sup> 2011 [http://www.forbes.com/sites/erikkain/2011/08/03/swat-team-raids-raw-milk-farm-rawesome-arrests-owner/\\_3rd](http://www.forbes.com/sites/erikkain/2011/08/03/swat-team-raids-raw-milk-farm-rawesome-arrests-owner/_3rd) August 2011, Accessed 20<sup>th</sup> March 2014.

The Guardian Website The Observer, *Detroit gets growing* . By Paul Harris published July 11<sup>th</sup> 2010 <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2010/jul/11/detroit-urban-renewal-city-farms-paul-harris> Accessed April 18<sup>th</sup> 2014.

The Guardian Website, *Worldwide cancer cases expected to soar by 70% over next 20 years*, By Sarah Boseley, published Monday 3<sup>rd</sup> Febuary 2014, <http://www.theguardian.com/society/2014/feb/03/worldwide-cancer-cases-soar-next-20-years> Accessed April 19<sup>th</sup> 2014.

Time Magazine Website, *Got Raw Milk? Be very quiet*. By Wendy Cole, published Mar. 13th, 2007 <http://content.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,1598525,00.html> Accessed April 20<sup>th</sup> 2014.

Time Magazine Website, *Subway: That Yoga Mat Chemical is Almost Out of Our Bread*, by Alex Rogers, Published April 11<sup>th</sup> 2014 <http://time.com/59542/subway-bread-yoga-mat-chemical/> Accessed April 19<sup>th</sup> 2014.

The New York Times 1874, Published: April 30, 1874  
Copyright © The New York Times.

The New York Times 1886, Published: August 9, 1886  
Copyright © The New York Times.

The New York Times Website, *Despite Support in Party, Democratic Governors Resist Legalizing Marijuana* by Adam Nagourney published April 5<sup>th</sup> 2014  
[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/06/us/politics/despite-support-in-party-democratic-governors-resist-legalizing-marijuana.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/06/us/politics/despite-support-in-party-democratic-governors-resist-legalizing-marijuana.html?_r=0) Accessed April 18<sup>th</sup> 2014.

The Washington Post Website, *Political push for raw, unpasteurized milk is increasing access, but illnesses are up, too* by Kimberly Kindy, Published April 5<sup>th</sup> 2014.  
[http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/political-push-for-raw-unpasteurized-milk-is-increasing-access-but-illnesses-are-up-too/2014/04/04/e62bc884-b443-11e3-8020-b2d790b3c9e1\\_story.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/political-push-for-raw-unpasteurized-milk-is-increasing-access-but-illnesses-are-up-too/2014/04/04/e62bc884-b443-11e3-8020-b2d790b3c9e1_story.html)  
Accessed: April 18<sup>th</sup> 2014.

The Washington Times, *Feds sting Amish farmer selling raw milk locally, cite interstate commerce violation*, By Stephen Dinen,  
<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/apr/28/feds-sting-amish-farmer-selling-raw-milk-locally/?page=all> 28<sup>th</sup> April 2011, Accessed 20<sup>th</sup> March 2014.

US News Website *The 2014 US and World Populations*. Blog Post by Robert Schlesinger  
<http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/robert-schlesinger/2013/12/31/us-population-2014-317-million-and-71-billion-in-the-world> December 31 2013. Accessed April 20<sup>th</sup> 2014.

## Internet:

Avery's Branch Farm Website <http://www.averysbranchfarms.com/cowshareinfo.htm>. Accessed April 20<sup>th</sup> 2014.

NPR Website, "The Salt" blog, *Farm Free or Die! Maine Towns Rebel Against Food Rules* by Maria Godoy, July 21<sup>st</sup> 2013, <http://www.npr.org/blogs/thesalt/2013/05/28/186955163/farm-free-or-die-maine-towns-rebel-against-food-rules> Accessed April 18<sup>th</sup> 2014.

Farmageddon Website, <http://farmageddonmovie.com/film/>, Accessed April 19<sup>th</sup> 2014.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Website, *Heart Disease Facts*  
<http://www.cdc.gov/heartdisease/facts.htm> Accessed April 19<sup>th</sup> 2014.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Website, *FastStats: Leading Causes of Death*  
<http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/fastats/lcod.htm> Accessed April 19th 2014.

United Nations Website, *Indigenous Peoples' Right to Food Crucially Dependent on Control of Resources in Land, Territories They Inhabit, Permanent Forum Told*. May 2012.  
<http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2012/hr5092.doc.htm>.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Website 2012, Dairy Production.  
<http://www.epa.gov/oecaagct/ag101/printdairy.html> Updated 27.6.2012. Accessed 12.3.2014.

World Development Movement Website, *What is Food Sovereignty?* <http://www.wdm.org.uk/food-sovereignty> Accessed 24.2.2014.

The Weston A. Price Foundation Website, <http://www.westonaprice.org/>, Accessed April 9<sup>th</sup> 2014.

### Suggested reading:

Kurtz, Hilda.; Trauger, Amy.& Passidomo, Catarina (2013) *The contested terrain of biological citizenship in the seizure of raw milk in Athens, Georgia*. *Geoforum* 48, 136-144.

Lebasco, Kathleen (2011) *Neoliberalism, Public Health and the Moral Perils of Fatness*. *Critical Public Health* Vol. 21, No. 2, June 2011, 153–164.

Rich, Emma (2011) *'I see her being obesed!': Public Pedagogy, Reality Media and the Obesity Crisis*  
 2011 15:3-21 *Health* (London).

Rysst, Mari(2010) *"Healthism" and Looking Good: Body Ideals and Body Practices in Norway*. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 2010; 38(Suppl 5): 71–80 .